DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 156 CE 029 307

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth B.
TITLE Career Education: Retrospect and Prospect. Monographs on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Office of Career Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 81
NOTE 76p.
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington DC 20402.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; Change Strategies; Community Involvement; Definitions; Educational History; *Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; Federal Aid; Financial Support; Futures (of Society); Position Papers; Postsecondary Education; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; Secondary Education; Stereotypes; Teacher Role; Trend Analysis; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS United States

ABSTRACT

This monograph examines the first 10 years and probable future of the career education movement in the United States. The first part outlines changes that have occurred in the 1970s in the following areas: definition of career education, defining skills to be delivered by career education efforts, career education/vocational education relationships, community involvement in implementing career education, role of classroom teachers in career education, reduction of bias and stereotyping, the kinds and magnitudes of change called for by career education, federal support for career education, career education/organized labor relationships, involvement of postsecondary education in career education, and assessing the effectiveness of career education. In the second part the following five issues affecting the future of career education are discussed: (1) the extent to which national priorities will be devoted to the supply versus the demand side of the supply/demand equation, (2) career education's role as a vehicle for increasing school/community partnership efforts, (3) career education as a vehicle to effect basic changes in the formal education system, (4) overcoming current major deficiencies of career education, and (5) future availability of sound professional leadership for career education at the state and local levels. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED203156

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

CAREER EDUCATION: RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

by

Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director
Office of Career Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

January 1981

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Terrell H. Bell, Secretary

CE029507

Career Education: Retrospect and Prospect

Kenneth B. Hoyt
Director, Office of Career Education
United States Department of Education

Introduction

So far as can be determined, the term "career education" was first coined in a publication of the Educational Policies Commission of the NEA and AASA published in 1956 and entitled *Manpower and Education*. This can be illustrated in excerpts from that publication including the following:

> ". . .Vocation has significance for all education and the individual's entire education inevitably influences his career. . . . The manpower characteristics of the society into which pupils are moving and pupils' potential careers in that society are inescapable and valid concerns of general education in elementary and secondary schools. In the same spirit, liberal education at the college level attains vitality and validity as it relates to each student's future, including his career future. Liberal education need not be antivocational. . . . Career education is not only concerned with what lies inside the individual, but also with the individual's role in society. It is concerned both with talents and with the ways and means by which talents are put to use in a society that needs all the talents of all its citizens."

While that significant publication first coined the term "career education" and pointed to its need, the career education movement, per see, cannot be said to have begun prior to the time Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr. assumed the post of Commissioner of Education in the U.S. Office of Education in 1970. Commissioner Marland, by making career education the top priority of his tenure, must be credited with giving birth to career education as a movement.

It has now been slightly more than 10 full years since Commissioner Marland launched the career education movement. The first substantive U.S. Office of Education publication, published in 1971, was entitled *Career Education: A Handbook For Implementation*. Shortly thereafter, an expanded version of that publication appeared as the first book in career education and carried the title *Career Education: What It Is And How To Do It*. That book was published in 1972. As one of the major contributors to both of these early publications, I count both as representing my earliest conceptual contributions to the career education movement.

Since coming to USOE in February 1974 as Director of its Office of Career Education, I have written, as official Government publications, a fairly large number of monographs, each of which was designed to make some contribution to the evolving nature of career education. A complete listing of those monographs appears as an appendix in this publication. Literally thousands of persons, both through official "miniconferences" I have conducted with them

and through other professional interactions, have contributed to changes in ways in which I have attempted to conceptualize career education during the decade of the 1970s. Thanks to such persons, my tenure to date, in the Federal Government, has been a very rich learning experience indeed.

It now seems appropriate to review, for the record, major ways in which my conceptual thoughts regarding career education changed during the decade of the 1970s. I want to do so here for two major reasons. First, it seems to me such a review might provide helpful perspective to persons who study one or more of the specific Government Printing Office monographs I have written during the 1970s. Second, such a review at this time will hopefully serve as a benchmark against which Federal efforts in career education can be contrasted when the decade of the 1980s is concluded.

The kind of review found in this monograph is purposely designed to reflect my own personal thinking. In making a decision to follow such an approach, I mean, in no way, to ignore the fact that many other persons have made significant contributions to conceptualizing career education. A publication summarizing and contrasting the contributions of all such persons is badly needed. It does not seem to me proper that I should attempt such a review in a Government publication. Thus, the contents of this monograph are limited simply to changes in my own conceptual thinking. If such a review is helpful, it will be primarily because these changes, in effect, reflect changes in the official position of the Federal Government's Office of Career Education. That is all I can do here.

Each of what seem to me to represent the major dimensions of change in the evolving concept of career education will be discussed here under separate headings. I have omitted—as section headings—those areas where major change has not taken place in my thinking (e.g., the role of the counselor in career education, etc.). The final section of this monograph will be devoted to projecting still further changes in the career education movement which seem likely to occur during the decade of the 1980s.

Changes In The Definition Of Career Education

During the decade of the 1970s, I made four major attempts to define the term "career education" along with a large number of more informal attempts. The conceptual evolution through which my thinking has gone can be seen by contrasting these four major definitions. The four definitions are as follows:

In 1972, as part of my contribution to the book *Career Education: What It Is And How To Do It*, I defined career education as:

> "the total effort of public education and the community aimed at helping all individuals to become familiar with the values of a work-oriented society, to integrate these values into their personal value systems, and to implement these values into their lives in such a way that work becomes possible, meaningful, and satisfying to each individual."

In the USOE publication entitled *An Introduction To Career Education: A Policy Paper Of The U.S. Office of Education* published in 1975, I defined career definition as:

> "the totality of experiences through which one learns about and prepares to engage in work as part of her or his way of living."

When I wrote the USOE monograph entitled *A Primer For Career Education* published in 1977, I defined career education as:

> "an effort aimed at refocusing American education and the actions of the broader community in ways that will help individuals acquire and utilize the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for each to make work a meaningful, productive, and satisfying part of his or her way of living."

Finally, in 1978, with publication of the USOE monograph entitled *Refining The Concept of Collaboration In Career Education*, I abandoned any attempt to make a simple, one sentence definition of "career education" and, instead, presented a definition that required three printed pages to reproduce. That definition (1) identified 10 specific career education skills; (2) provided 14 examples of specific kinds of career education activities; (3) named 4 broad segments of the community whose resources are needed in the career education effort; (4) suggested examples of 14 kinds of community organizations who, along with others, may be involved in tapping the broader community for career education resources; (5) named 12 examples of community segments (including the education system) who might properly be involved in the delivery of career education; and (6) suggested that the total effort be coordinated through some form of "career education action council."

The similarities in these four definitions are much more apparent than their differences. The major similarities include the following concepts:

1. Career education is rooted, at its bedrock, in the four letter word "work" and in education/work relationships.
2. Career education is an effort intended to be applicable to *all* persons at *all* age levels—including *all* kinds of educational settings.
3. Career education is an effort that demands the joint participation of the education system *and* the broader community—i.e., it is not something the education system can accomplish by itself.
4. The word "work" includes unpaid as well as paid activities.

The 1972 definition obviously differs from those formulated later in terms of the central importance it assigns to the "values of a work oriented society." Those who study the 1972 book will observe that the term "work ethic" frequently appears in ways that make that term almost synonymous in meaning to the phrase "values of a work oriented society." In retrospect, there is no doubt but that my earliest attempts to define the term "career education" were rooted in a deep philosophical commitment to the "work ethic"—i.e., I sincerely believed that each person has a societal obligation to work. This includes an obligation to society in general, to one's country, and to one's God. I must admit that *my* personal value system still includes this basic belief.

By 1973, I realized that, no matter how strongly I held such a belief for myself, I could not use it as a conceptual basis for the career education movement. Too many persons held different beliefs. This basic change in direction, on my part, was first expressed in an article appearing in the January, 1973 issue of the *American Vocational Journal* entitled "The Future of Work" — and later reprinted as Article 29 in my 1975 book entitled *Career Education: Contributions To An Evolving Concept*. It was in that article where I first attempted to offer a definition of "work" to mean:

> "One's efforts aimed at the production of goods or services that will be beneficial to one's fellow human beings or to oneself."

The basic switch in my thinking that occurred was from a view that held "work" to be something one owed to society to a view that held "work" to be something one owed to oneself — i.e., from viewing "work" in a moralistic sense to viewing "work" in a moral sense. That article, while admittedly only an embryonic attempt, is one that I would consider worthy of some study even now.

By 1975, when the document *An Introduction to Career Education: A Policy Paper of the U.S. Office of Education* was published, I had further refined my thinking with respect to the meaning of the word "work." That definition reads as follows:

> "Work is conscious effort, other than that whose primary purpose is either coping or relaxation, aimed at producing benefits for oneself and/or for oneself and others."

My earlier emphasis on the importance of productivity was retained in that definition. However, the meaning of the word "work" was translated from a societal obligation to a basic human need of all human beings — the human need to *do;* to *achieve;* to be *someone* because one did *something;* the need to know that one is needed by others, in part, for what one *does*.

This conceptual change provided several advantages including: (1) it allows for the obvious changes in personal value systems — including work values — that are taking place among both youth and adults in our society; (2) it allows work values to be thought of in terms of why one kind of work is chosen over another — rather than in terms of why some people choose to work and others do not; (3) it affords a rationale for including unpaid work in the career education concept along with a simultaneous rationale for explaining why some people are in occupations where the basic *human* need for work cannot be well met; (4) it provides a rationale with respect to the need for career education that is independent of current economic conditions and/or unemployment statistics that exist at a particular point in time; and (5) it provides a basis of support for career education that is broad enough to satisfy educators, the business/labor/industry community, parents, and the general public.

This obviously humanistic view of the meaning of the word "work" has continued to form the bedrock basis of meaning for the term "career education," in my thinking, since that time. I have resisted — and continue to resist — those

who want to substitute the word "life" for the word "work" as the conceptual bedrock for career education. In my opinion, the word "Life" is too all encompassing. Were that word to be adopted as the bedrock conceptual basis for career education, we would run the risks of: (1) losing much of the support we currently enjoy from the business/labor/industry community; (2) losing the central importance of bringing a more proper and appropriate emphasis to the goal of "education as preparation for work" among the basic goals of American Education; (3) losing the importance of emphasizing the human need to work in terms of *productivity* goals; and (4) promising more than can reasonably be expected to be delivered in terms of basic change in American Education. Career education – important as it is – is not *all* of Education. "Work" – important as it is – is not *all* of Life. The goal of "education as preparation for work" – important as it is – is not the *only* basic goal of American Education. If we broaden our perspective and our aspirations too far, we run the risk of failing to remember – and to deliver on – the basic reasons why we came into existence in the first place. That is a risk I am neither interested in nor willing to take.

Changes In Defining Skills To Be Delivered By Career Education Efforts

The decade of the 1970s – career education's first decade of existence – saw four major emphases placed on defining and describing benefits persons are expected to receive after having been exposed to career education. (Note that, while not apparent at the beginning of the decade, this topic is clearly seen, in 1980, as only part of the broader problem of evaluating the effectiveness of a total career education effort. That topic will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.)

Beginning attempts went in two basic directions. One large concentration of effort was placed on what could, in retrospect, perhaps best be described as attempting to acquaint persons with the career development process using a strong emphasis on the traditional values of a work oriented society. Examples of such concepts found in the 1972 publication *Career Education: What It Is And How To Do It* include:

1. At least some people must work if society is to survive
2. All work needed by society is honorable
3. Work that is enjoyed by some people is disliked by others
4. A career is built from a succession of jobs

These concepts – and many more – were seen as ones to be given persons in a developmental fashion starting with career awareness and going through career exploration, career planning, and career preparation all the way to career entry and progression. The emphasis was clearly on teaching persons something about the nature of the world of work coupled with an emphasis both on emphasizing the traditional values of a work oriented society and on teaching basic elements in the career development process. The overall goal clearly was one of helping persons develop more positive views of work in our

society and ready themselves for becoming active participants in the occupational society.

A second major emphasis, occurring simultaneously, was the USOE effort to develop and disseminate basic information concerning occupations – with special emphasis on education/work relationships – organized around 15 occupational clusters developed by USOE. These 15 occupational clusters – intended to represent almost the entire occupational society – were also intended to emphasize all kinds and levels of education needed for participation in the various occupations appearing in each of the 15 "clusters." That is, each "cluster" was intended to include occupations ranging, in terms of educational preparation required, from those requiring less than a high school diploma to those requiring graduate/professional preparation. The goal was clearly to help persons become acquainted with the nature of the occupational society in terms of educational preparation patterns required to enter it. It was an attempt to help teachers and students alike better understand and appreciate the career implications of subject matter.

Without seeking to abandon either of these earlier efforts, the USOE publication entitled *An Introduction To Career Education: A Policy Paper Of The U.S. Office of Education* sought to expand the concept through identifying nine specific "learner outcomes" for career education intended to be given to any person at the point where that person leaves the formal Education System – whether that be at the secondary or postsecondary level. That document contended that career education seeks to produce individuals who, when they leave school (at any age or any level) are:

1. Competent in the basic academic skills required for adaptability in our rapidly changing society
2. Equipped with good work habits
3. Capable of choosing and who have chosen a personally meaningful set of work values that foster in them a desire to work
4. Equipped with career decisionmaking skills, job-hunting skills, and job-getting skills
5. Equipped with vocational/personal skills at a level that will allow them to gain entry into and attain a degree of success in the occupational society
6. Equipped with career decisions based on the widest possible set of data concerning themselves and their educational/vocational opportunities
7. Aware of means available to them for continuing and recurrent education once they have left the formal system of schooling
8. Successful in being placed in a paid occupation, in further education, or in a vocation consistent with their current career education
9. Successful in incorporating work values into their total personal value structure in such a way that they are able to choose what, for them, is a desirable lifestyle

This basic list of "learner outcomes" was revised, in slightly different form and appears in two 1977 USOE publications including *A Primer For Career Education* and *Perspectives On The Problem of Evaluation In Career Education*.

A major conceptual change occurred near the end of the decade of the 1970s. At that time, due in part to continuing demands that the terms "career education" and "vocational education" be clearly differentiated in meaning, it was decided to define "career education skills" in terms of a set of general employability/adaptability/promotability skills needed by all persons in order to cope with the increased rapidity of change in the occupational society. By making this conceptual change, "career education skills" could be clearly differentiated from the kinds of specific vocational skills that represent the primary mission of vocational education. The desire to clearly differentiate "career education" from "vocational education" in meaning, however, was only a secondary and not a primary reason for this change in conceptual strategy.

The primary reasons for this conceptual change were: (1) to identify those general employability/adaptability/promotability skills that can best be taught in a developmental, longitudinal fashion—and so justify the career education movement as one that involves the entire system of Education; and (2) to respond clearly to the obviously increasing need for such skills in our current society. As of 1980, the "ten basic career education skills" to be imparted to persons through a comprehensive, developmental career education effort include:

1. The basic academic skills of mathematics and of oral/written communication
2. Skills in using and practicing good work habits
3. Skills in developing and employing a personally meaningful set of work values that motivate the individual to want to work
4. Skills in gaining a basic understanding of and an appreciation for the American system of private enterprise—including organized labor as part of that system
5. Skills in self-understanding and understanding of available educational/occupational opportunities
6. Career decisionmaking skills
7. Job seeking/finding/getting/holding skills
8. Skills in making productive use of leisure time through unpaid work—including volunteerism and work performed within the home/family structure
9. Skills in overcoming bias and stereotyping as they act to deter full freedom of career choice for all persons
10. Skills in humanizing the workplace for oneself

To understand the underlying dynamics behind this conceptual change, it is necessary to examine these 10 "career education skills" in two groupings. "Group A" includes the first 4 and "Group B" includes the last six. The four

career education skills included in "Group A" represent those designed to be most appealing to members of the business/labor/industry/professional/Government community. Employers have, for years, been pleading with the Education system to provide them with persons who: (a) have the basic skills of oral/written communication and mathematics; (b) have good work habits leading to productivity in the workplace; (c) have a true desire to work; and (d) have a basic understanding and appreciation of the economic system of the United States – including an understanding that "profit" is a good and necessary word in that system. Employers have no serious objections to the six skills in "Group B" and, as a matter of fact, are generally supportive of them. However, it seems clear that their primary concerns lie in making sure that persons who apply to them for employment are equipped with the skills in "Group A."

Educators, parents, and many members of the broader community, on the other hand, tend to place their primary emphasis on the six career education skills included in "Group B." This simply reflects the importance such persons place on (a) a humanistic view of the role of work in a person's total lifestyle, and (b) an absolute commitment to protecting freedom of career choice for the individual in ways that allow the individual to exercise maximum control over her/his own destiny. Such persons have no objections to the skills in "Group A" provided the skills in "Group B" are considered to be an equally important part of the total effort.

Furthermore, when these 10 "career education skills" are pictured in this manner, it can be easily demonstrated to persons from the private sector that they need to join forces with educators to deliver these skills – and vice versa. Thus, we have a firm conceptual basis for making career education a total *community* effort and one that can – and will – be supported by a wide variety of community segments as well as by the formal Education system.

The need for equipping ALL persons with these 10 career education skills is becoming increasingly obvious. The one certainty facing us in these times is the certainty of occupational and societal change. Areas such as energy, health, communications, technology, international relations, and changing population statistics all point toward this certainty of change. No person knows, with any degree of exactness, the kind of occupational society those children now in our elementary schools will find during their adult working lives. We do know that change will occur. We know further that, no matter how great that change is or the exact directions it takes, ALL persons will have to possess these 10 career education skills if they are to make productive contributions to society. We also know that most persons will have to exercise such skills at several points in their lives – from youth up to and including the retirement years. Thus, the need for career education is easily pictured as a continuing need that will exist as far as we can see into the future. It is, in no way, a short term, temporary need.

Such a picture of need is essential for justifying the basic kinds of changes within the formal Education system called for by career education. It has

been – and continues to be – my contention that real *change* in the formal Education system can come about only through changes in the basic attitudes, skills, knowledges, and actions of educators – i.e., that the emphasis must be on "people change." Basic change cannot and will not occur through a "program add-on" approach – i.e., through simply adding yet another course, curriculum, building, or set of specialists to all those now in existence. The fact that most school leavers are not now equipped with the 10 career education skills is obvious. Thus, the need for the kinds of changes in the formal Education system called for by career education is equally obvious.

These 10 "career education skills" have been purposely pictured in ways that make clear they are best delivered through a longitudinal, developmental approach. This has been purposely done in order to: (a) emphasize the need for change in the entire system of Education; and (b) avoid making career education a separate "empire" to be "owned" by any single segment of the Education system or the broader community. That is why I try always to use the term "career education *effort*" but never use the term "career education *program*." The point is, no single "program" – no matter how large or expensive it might become – could possibly be as effective in delivering these 10 career education skills as a total community *effort*. None of the hundreds of kinds of "programs" now in existence have ever, by themselves, proven successful in delivering the 10 career education skills to ALL youth in the Education system. We need to worry less about how much "credit" each program receives and worry more about how much *help* youth receive.

Changes In Career Education/Vocational Education Relationships

In *Career Education: What It Is And How To Do It* published in 1972, "vocational education" was defined as one of five basic components in "career education." Again, in the USOE policy paper *An Introduction To Career Education* published in 1974, "vocational education" was defined as a part of "career education." By the time *A Primer For Career Education* was published in 1977, I had removed "vocational education" from my basic definition of "career education." As we look back on the decade of the 1970s and ahead to the decade of the 1980s, it seems appropriate to review the history of and basic rationale for this important conceptual change.

In the early 1970s, I saw "career education" as a term that encompassed the entire goal of "education as preparation for work" in American Education. So long as career education was pictured as covering that entire goal, it was both necessary and appropriate to picture "vocational education" as a component in career education. That is, no one would deny the critical importance and contributions of vocational education to attaining that goal. It was only when career education became defined, in part, in terms of the 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills discussed in the preceding section that it became inappropriate to include "vocational education" as a component of "career education." There is a need now to explain both the

conceptual basis for this change and the reasons why I have tried to make this change.

First, the conceptual basis for this change can be explained in the following way:

1. The *primary* justification for any course or curriculum must rest on the set of instructional skills and knowledge it seeks to impart to students. Thus, the *primary* justification for "science education" lies in the skills and knowledge of science. Similarly, the *primary* justification for courses and curriculums in "vocational education" lies in the specific vocational skills and knowledge of each subject area in vocational education.
2. The *long run* justification for the Education system itself lies in its ability to attain its *basic* goals, not simply the specific instructional goals of any given course or curriculum. Contributions to such basic goals as preparing students for: (a) work; (b) home/family living; (c) health; (d) citizenship; or (e) understanding and appreciation of our cultural heritage must be made by ALL parts of the entire Education system.
3. The *basic* Education goal of "preparation for work" must, in these times, be seen as being met by a combination of the specific instructional skills/knowledge of each course *and* the general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education. Since each teacher contributes to preparing students for work, in part, through the instructional skills and knowledge he/she teaches, there is no more reason to include "vocational education" as a component of "career education" than to include "mathematics education" as a component of "career education."
4. Simply because the specific instructional skills of vocational education are oriented primarily around the basic goal of "preparation for work" cannot, by itself, serve as a justification for including "vocational education" as a component of "career education."
5. The single part of the basic goal of "preparation for work" towards which ALL teachers can be seen as making the same generic kind of contribution is limited to general employability/adaptability/promotability skills. Since "career education" is concerned about such generic, common kinds of contributions, it is then proper to limit the meaning of the term "career education" to these kinds of skills.
6. Since the goal of "preparation for work" is only one among a number of basic goals of Education, it would be improper to contend that "ALL Education is career education." Thus, "career education" must be defined in terms of the general employability/adaptability/promotability skills toward which ALL teachers contribute.

Second, the practical reasons leading to formulation of the conceptual rationale presented above need to be made clear. Such reasons include the following:

1. Confusion, among both educators and the general public, with respect to the differences in meaning between the terms "vocational education" and "career education" have been common during the decade of the 1970s. So long as "vocational education" was defined as a component of "career education," that confusion remained. The only way to overcome this confusion was to separate the meaning of these two terms.
2. "Vocational education" is too big—and "career education" is too small—for a situation to exist where "career education" claims "vocational education" as only one of its components. Operationally, in terms of budgets, programs, and personnel, the conceptual rationale used in the early 1970s was incapable of being converted into operational reality.
3. Until differences in meaning between "career education" and "vocational education" were clarified, many academic teachers thought that "career education" was asking them to contribute towards the goals of "vocational education." They were not about to do that until, by emphasizing career education in terms of general employability/adaptability/promotability skills, we were able to show academic teachers that the goals of career education were, in part, *their* goals.
4. It was important for educators, members of the business/labor/industry/professional/Government community, and the general public to see "career education" as a major *new* thrust. So long as it included the *old* emphasis on vocational education, this was difficult to accomplish.
5. It was important—especially for organized labor and organizations representing minority persons—to see career education as something much broader than simply a mechanism for use in recruiting youth for vocational education. By defining "career education" in terms of general employability/adaptability/promotability skills needed by ALL students—those planning on college attendance as well as those who are not—this obstacle has been largely overcome.
6. It was important for all of postsecondary education—including colleges and universities opposed to vocational education—to see "career education" as an effort applicable to their students as well as to those in the K-12 setting. By clearly separating the meanings of the terms "career education" and "vocational education," progress has been made here.
7. It was crucial that the specific entry level vocational skills which represent the *primary* skills/knowledge imparted through vocational education courses continue to be emphasized as important. The danger was one of moving toward replacing such specific entry level vocational skills with the general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education. By clearly separating the meaning of these two terms, that danger has been avoided. The way re-

mains open to continue emphasizing the need for specific entry level vocational skills of vocational education.

Some vocational educators have resisted – and appear to resent – this conceptual change that clearly separates the meaning of the terms "vocational education" and "career education." In effect, they contend that the 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education have, for years, been ones taught to students in vocational education classes. Thus, they say career education has no "right" to take such skills out of the meaning of the term "vocational education." It should be clear from this discussion that career education has no intentions of taking the 10 "career education skills" out of the broad meaning of the term "vocational education." It would be much more proper to recognize that career education is trying to insert its 10 "career education skills" into the meaning of all other parts of Education in addition to vocational education.

There is no legitimate way that vocational education can claim the 10 skills of career education as their *exclusive* province. In the first place, these 10 skills are ones that must be taught in a developmental, longitudinal fashion. They cannot wait to be introduced until persons have enrolled in vocational education. In the second place, these 10 skills are needed by ALL students – and only a portion of the student body enrolls in vocational education. In the third place, even if one considers only the secondary school setting (where most of vocational education operates) there is no legitimate way for vocational educators to claim that only teachers of vocational education should be charged with equipping youth with the 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education. If our concern is for the effectiveness with which youth are provided these 10 skills, then the potential contributions of ALL teachers for equipping youth with such skills must be recognized.

Since "career education" operates as an effort to be infused within ALL existing Education programs – rather than as yet another "program" to be added to all of those now in existence – it cannot be legitimately said that career education seeks to "take away" from *any* existing program. It would be much more accurate to say that career education is an effort to "put into" rather than "take away" from existing programs.

By emphasizing the need for and importance of the 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of "career education," we are, in no way, acting to downplay the importance of the specific entry level vocational skills that represent the primary instructional skills/knowledge of vocational education. On the contrary, career education advocates have always emphasized – and continue to emphasize – the need for and importance of vocational education. To say that vocational education is *necessary*, but not *sufficient*, to prepare youth for work in these times is, in no way, to be critical of vocational education. The truth is, career education advocates have been supporters – not critics – of vocational education. Certainly, the general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education will not, by themselves,

be sufficient to prepare youth for work. Specific vocational skills – of the plumber or the poet – will be needed in addition. We have never, otherwise, pretended.

Changes In Community Involvement In Implementing Career Education

From the beginning, career education advocates have called for the active involvement of the broader community in career education. One of career education's basic conceptual assumptions that has remained solid since its inception is that career education represents an effort that the formal Education system cannot effectively accomplish by itself. The broader community *must* be involved if this effort is to succeed.

A brief capsule of changes in this area that occurred during the decade of the 1970s can be given, it seems to me, by thinking of three basic stages through which the career education movement has passed. Stage I – taking place between 1970 to 1976 – is one which could be called the "Cooperation Stage." Stage II – taking place from 1976 through 1977 – can be called the "Collaboration Stage." Stage III – initiated in 1978 and continuing to the present time – can be called the "Coalition Stage" of career education. Each of these three "Stages" has evolved in ways that incorporate elements of the earlier stage as part of the "Stage" which succeeded it. That is, we have not gone from one "Stage" to another by abandoning the basic principles and concepts of the earlier stage. It would be more correct to say that it has been a process of "adding to" than to say that it has been a process of "substituting for." While this capsule view is accurate, it is not an adequate explanation of the real dynamics that were – and are – taking place. Let us look at this area in some greater depth.

Even in the 1972 book *Career Education: What It Is And How To Do It*, we recognized that more than simple "cooperation" was needed from the broader community. In that book, the term "participation" was used to describe this perceived need for broader involvement. In that book, the "participation" being sought from what was then described as "Employers, Employees, and Labor Organizations" was put in terms of 7 specific requests for help including:

1. Serving as a source of information
2. Serving as a source of observation
3. Providing work experience and work-study programs for students
4. Providing work-study programs for educators
5. Providing occupational education and training within the occupational society itself
6. Making work meaningful to employed workers
7. Participating in job placement programs

In some ways, this set of seven kinds of involvement is broader than what is currently being proposed. This is due to the fact that, in the early days of

career education, we envisioned it as being a much broader kind of societal change than it has actually turned out to be. In a basic conceptual sense, each of the 7 kinds of involvement listed above would, in my view, continue to be considered as desirable.

By 1974, when the USOE policy paper *An Introduction To Career Education* was published, what was then called the "business-labor-industry community" was being asked to:

1. Provide observational, work experience, and work-study opportunities for students *and* for those who educate students (teachers, counselors, and school administrators)
2. Serve as career development resource personnel for teachers, counselors, and students
3. Participate in part-time and full-time job placement programs
4. Participate actively and positively in programs designed to reduce worker alienation
5. Participate in career education policy formulation

The 1972 emphasis on asking the business/labor/industry community to become a part of the kinds of societal changes called for by career education can be seen to have been continued. The first hints of moving from "Stage I" to "Stage II" can be seen in the listing of the fifth step.

The 1977 USOE monograph *A Primer For Career Education* (which was designed to replace the 1974 monograph entitled *An Introduction To Career Education*) listed the following seven roles for what, in that publication, was called the "business/labor/industry/professional/government community":

1. Serving as resource persons in the classroom to help students and teachers understand and appreciate the career implications of the subject matter
2. Providing resources for field trips taken by students and/or educators for purposes of helping them become aware of the world of paid employment
3. Serving as resource persons in the classroom – and inservice education efforts – to help both students and members of the teaching faculty understand the basic nature and operations of the free enterprise system, economic education, and the role and functions of organized labor in American society
4. Providing resources for work experience opportunities for students – paid or unpaid – whose primary purpose is career exploration
5. Serving as members of a "community career education action council" whose purpose is basically to develop and recommend career education policies to various segments of the community (including, but not limited to, the formal education system)
6. Serving as active participants in the education system's placement efforts (including both part-time and full-time job placement)
7. Devising and implementing ways of involving employees of the business/labor/industry/professional/government community in

career education activities designed to contribute to the career development of such employees.

Additionally, that same publication listed five more roles to be played by what were referred to as "existing community organizations having education/work goals" including:

1. Studying and making provisions for involvement and participation of maximum numbers of school age youth in their organizational activities
2. Studying and making provisions for ways in which their activities and programmatic efforts can be fitted into the total career education effort—rather than operating independent of or in competition with that effort
3. Studying and making provisions for ways in which the total resources of the community may be utilized and shared by all such organizations in ways that provide maximum benefits for youth and efficient use of community resources
4. Studying and making provisions for ways in which the efforts of each of these community organizations can be made a supplementary, rather than a competitive, resource for student use in career awareness and career exploration activities
5. Serving as members of a "community career education action council"

Clearly, these two lists of roles found in *A Primer For Career Education* represented significant movement from "Stage I" to "Stage II" and pointed the way toward "Stage III." For the first time, it was recognized explicitly that members of the broader community have a policy-making role, in addition to a participatory role, in career education. In addition, this was the first explicit recognition of the facts that: (a) other community forces, outside the formal Education system (such as Junior Achievement, Boy Scouts of America, Girl Scouts of the USA, and 4-H) are already operating various forms of career education efforts; and (b) the total community resources available to help implement career education are finite and must, somehow, be shared among all community elements participating in the total career education effort.

January, 1978 saw publication of the USOE monograph *The Concept Of Collaboration In Career Education*. In that publication, the general notion of viewing career education as a *community* effort involving joint *authority*, joint *responsibility*, and joint *accountability* for each of several segments of the community—including, but not limited to the formal education system—was made explicit. The *call* for collaboration was based on recognizing a number of youth needs in the education/work relationships domain that could obviously be better met if various segments of the community joined forces rather than continuing to have each segment trying to meet those needs all by itself. The potential *success* of collaboration, however, was recognized

in that monograph as demanding a "what's in it for me?" framework for use in making collaboration in career education a *sustaining* effort. That is, it was recognized that a common concern for the needs of youth can readily serve as a basis for *beginning* a collaborative effort but, if that effort is to be a *sustaining* one, the "what's in it for me?" question must be answered for each segment of the community. We had clearly moved, with that publication, from a "Stage I – cooperation" to a "Stage II – collaboration" phase in the conceptualization of career education.

The concept of a community collaborative effort aimed at helping to solve work/education relationship problems for ALL members of the community was an obviously powerful one. It was, essentially, the same basic concept that Willard Wirtz had utilized in his classic book, *The Boundless Resource* in which he proposed creation of Community Work/Education Councils which, while involving as participants many segments of the community, would function autonomously in such a way that the Council is not under the direct control or authority of *any* segment of the community – including the Education system. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind regarding the conceptual soundness of forming and operating such a Community Work/Education Council. At the same time, it seemed to me that this represented too much of a quantum leap for the formal Education system to take in the evolving career education movement. For this reason, when the primary audience to be served is in-school youth, I have proposed creation and operation of Community Career Education Action Councils whose members are appointed by and report to the local Board of Education. That proposal has now become a policy of the National School Boards Association and can be clearly seen in the 1978 film NSBA produced on "Community Partnerships In Career Education." At this point in time, it still seems to me that this is as far as most communities will be willing and able to go. In saying this, I am, in no way, objecting to or criticizing the approximately 30 communities in the Nation who have formed and are now operating Community Work/Education Councils under the model that Wirtz proposed. I am simply saying that, if we want to implement career education on a Nationwide basis, we cannot now afford to go that far with efforts involving in-school youth and expect that most formal Education systems will agree to be active participants.

In August 1978, a USOE monograph entitled *Refining The Concept Of Collaboration In Career Education* was published. That monograph – actually written more than a year after *The Concept of Collaboration In Career Education* – represented my first direct attempt to move beyond the concept of "collaboration" into the concept of "coalition building." It was in that monograph that I published the three page definition of career education which, while now in need of revision, still represents my basic current thinking. My basic reasons for moving toward the "coalition building" concept of community involvement in career education included:

1. The career education resources of any community are finite thus requiring that they be used in an effective and efficient manner.

2. Many segments of the community, in addition to the formal Education system, are calling for the same kinds of community resources as are career education advocates in school settings.
3. In-school youth are receiving a great deal of career education assistance from out-of-school youth organizations. The total amount of assistance youth receive will be increased if the Education system collaborates with such organizations in the wise use of community resources.
4. A variety of community organizations, each having great interest in assisting youth in education/work relationship problems, exist who have ready access to community resources and are expert in the recruitment and use of community volunteers. School systems need their help.
5. The Education system, in past efforts to involve the community in career education, has tended too much to work with business/labor/industry organizations in a 1:1 fashion thus resulting in the overuse (and so "burn out") of some and the underutilization of others.
6. The "1 on 1" approach to utilizing community resources for career education typically results in underutilization of small, independent businesses – one of the most valuable resources. These organizations are typically loosely organized in a variety of kinds of community civic and service organizations, many of which are anxious to work with the formal Education system.
7. If coalitions are formed with a variety of kinds of community organizations, chances are greatly improved that we will be able to make maximally effective and efficient use of ALL community resources. For example, a local Chamber of Commerce will be much more effective in pulling business organizations together in a coordinated collaborative way with the Education system than would the Education system acting on its own.
8. Because the community organizations each typically has reasons for interacting with the formal Education system that extend far beyond the boundaries of career education, the "coalition" concept allows career education to be used as a vehicle for improving school system/community interaction in general. This is badly needed.

The last point in the above list is especially crucial and deserves some elaboration here. For almost the entire 10 year period of operation for career education, we have found various elements of the community very anxious to form relationships with the formal Education system for a great variety of reasons. Almost without exception, such community elements have raised, in miniconferences I have held with them, a whole host of concerns with reference to the Education system that extended considerably beyond the confines of career education. They saw career education as: (a) an effort where their help was badly needed and toward which they could make concrete helpful contributions; and (b) as an opportunity to have more interaction with the entire Education system.

An equally important advantage of the "coalition" approach—as opposed to only the "collaboration" approach—is that it allows each community organization belonging to the "coalition" to gain increased community visibility, respect, and credit for their efforts while still recognizing "career education" as a total community effort. To capitalize on this potential, it became apparent, during the 1978-80 period, that the kinds of general lists of 5-7 major kinds of activities listed earlier in this section would have to be put in more concrete, specific form so that each "partner" community organization could pick one or more specific projects for themselves. As a result, by July 1980, the collective suggestions of a number of these community organizations and a number of State Career Education Coordinators had resulted in the following list of 64 specific kinds of "career education activities" available for choice by community organizations serving as "partners" in a community coalition career education effort:

A. Direct provision of career education to youth in local schools
   1. Serving as resource persons in classrooms to help students better understand careers—and relationships between careers and subject matter being studied
   2. Serving as career role models for groups of students and/or for individual students interested in knowing more about a particular career
   3. Providing opportunities in business/labor/industry settings for elementary school students to observe various occupations and visit with various kinds of workers
   4. Providing opportunities in business/labor/industry settings for junior/senior high school students to explore possible careers through visits to various places in the occupational society and talking with workers in various occupations
   5. Providing opportunities in business/labor/industry settings for senior high school students to obtain unpaid work experience being performed primarily for purposes of career exploration
   6. Providing opportunities in business/labor/industry settings for senior high school students to obtain paid work experience
   7. Providing entry level jobs for youths
   8. Conducting career education courses/units in classrooms that meet regularly for a period of several weeks
   9. Serving as resource persons to help students learn how to seek, find, get, and keep a job
   10. Taking students on field trips in the occupational society
   11. Serving as resource persons to help gain basic understanding regarding organized labor as part of our society
   12. Serving as resource persons to help students gain basic understanding and appreciation of the private enterprise system
   13. Helping students gain basic information useful in overcoming bias and stereotyping

14. Helping students gain basic information and experience in the career decisionmaking process
15. Helping students gain basic information regarding ways in which persons can make wise use of leisure time—including volunteerism done as unpaid work
16. Helping students gain basic understanding and appreciation of volunteerism as an important part of American society

B. Provision of career education materials and resources
17. Providing equipment and materials from the occupational society that can be used by educators in infusing career education into classes
18. Helping to identify and recruit resource persons from the business/labor/industry community for SEA/LEA career education efforts (NOTE: "SEA" means a State Department of Education and "LEA" means a local K-12 school district)
19. Establishing and operating community career education resource banks containing names/addresses/telephone numbers and area of expertise for SEA/LEA career education efforts
20. Providing SEAs/LEAs with career education materials that teachers and counselors can use in delivering career education to students
21. Providing a library of information about careers that can be used by students as reference material

C. Inservice Education in career education
22. Participating in inservice education aimed at helping educators understand more about the occupational society and how they might infuse a "careers" emphasis into their professional activities
23. Helping educators gain basic information regarding organized labor as part of our society
24. Helping educators gain basic information leading to an increased understanding and appreciation of the private enterprise system
25. Helping educators acquire basic information useful in overcoming bias and stereotyping
26. Helping educators learn basic information with respect to the career decisionmaking process
27. Direct help to educators in overcoming their biases and stereotypic attitudes with reference to race, sex, handicapping conditions, and age
28. Helping educators gain basic information regarding ways in which persons can make wise use of leisure time—including volunteerism done as unpaid work
29. Helping educators gain a better understanding and appreciation of *("X" community organization)* as part of American society
30. Helping educators gain a basic understanding and appreciation of the nature and importance of volunteerism in our society

31. Participating in inservice education aimed at helping teachers learn more about how to effectively use volunteers in the classroom
32. Participating in inservice education aimed at helping persons from the business/labor/industry community learn how to be better resource persons for career education
33. Participating in inservice education aimed at helping parents learn how they can provide more effective career education for their children
34. Providing educators with opportunities for field trips into the business/labor/industry community aimed at helping them acquire increased understanding of careers and our occupational society
35. Providing educators with opportunities for work experience (paid and/or unpaid) in the occupational society outside of the formal Education system that is aimed at increasing their understanding and appreciation of the occupational society
36. Participating, with educators, in inservice education aimed at helping teachers develop methods and approaches appropriate for use in infusing career education into classrooms
37. Serving as speakers/resource persons at State and local meetings of various professional education associations

D. Gaining public understanding of and support for career education
38. Organizing and conducting some form of campaign aimed at increasing general public awareness and understanding of career education
39. Gaining community support for career education through direct appearances as career education advocates
40. Gaining school board/administration support for career education
41. Gaining legislative support at the State/Federal levels for career education

E. Increasing effective parental involvement in career education
42. Conducting parent meetings aimed at increasing parental understanding of career education
43. Devising, publishing, and distributing materials for parents containing suggestions of ways in which they may provide effective career education for their own children
44. Providing parents, who are employed workers, with opportunities to serve as career education resource persons in classrooms where their children are students
45. Opening up business/labor/industry settings on weekends for planned field trips of families who want to learn more about the occupational society

F. Consultant/advisory functions in career education
46. Consulting with respect to ways of identifying resource persons from the business/labor/industry community for career education

47. Consulting with respect to establishing systems for cataloging and contacting resource persons from the business/labor/industry community for SEA/LEA career education efforts
48. Working with SEAs/LEAs in developing new career education materials for use in career education implementation
49. Identifying community volunteers who are willing to help SEA/LEA career education implementation efforts
50. Helping to establish some form of COMMUNITY CAREER EDUCATION ACTION COUNCIL
51. Serving as members on a COMMUNITY CAREER EDUCATION ACTION COUNCIL
52. Serving as resource consultants on how best to involve parents in the delivery of career education
53. Serving as resource consultants to SEAs/LEAs in devising criteria for evaluating career education that will have meaning for various segments of the general society

G. Providing recognition and encouragement to LEAs to do career education

54. Establishing and operating some kind of "reward/recognition" system for educators participating in career education
55. Establishing and operating some kind of "reward/recognition" system for youth participating in various kinds of career education activities
56. Devising and operating some kind of "reward/recognition" system for various kinds of professional education associations who are making outstanding efforts to implement career education

H. Direct help to SEA/LEA career education coordinators

57. Forming and/or participating in coalitions involving joint efforts of two or more community organizations who can contribute more to career education if they work together
58. Participating in the collection and analysis of evaluation data aimed at assessing the worth of career education
59. Providing SEAs/LEAs with information relative to desirable educational experience needed for participation in various careers
60. Serving as resource persons for and providers of career education to educators and students in private schools located in a given community
61. Providing financial support for LEA career education efforts
62. Providing unpaid volunteers capable of and willing to serve as career education staff persons at the SEA/LEA levels
63. Organizing and participating in community "career fairs" for youth and adults in a community
64. Serving as resources for and providers of career education to out-of-school youth and adults who are not and/or cannot be reached through career education efforts of the local school district

While obviously only an embryonic beginning (i.e., many more kinds of specific activities could – and must – be added) the listing reproduced above can be used as an illustration of things to be carried out in a "coalition" effort. More importantly, this list clearly illustrates what is meant when we say that career education must be a *community* effort – that it is *not* something the formal Education system can do by itself.

By stating these 64 kinds of community help needed, community organizations operating at the local level can each decide on one or more of these for *their* priority – and thus receive specific recognition for the particular kind of help they provide to the total career education effort. Similarly, a listing such as reproduced above allows the Education system, in any given community, to determine its priority needs for community participation. Thus, the potential is present for a custom-made community coalition career education effort in each local setting utilizing existing community organizations.

With this "Stage III" coalition approach to community involvement scarcely two years old, it is obviously far from having been implemented at any level – local, State, or National. Yet, the State Career Education Coordinators of our Nation, working collaboratively with each of 16 National community organizations, were able to draw up initial "blueprints for community action" with each National organization. All of this was accomplished under a contract made between the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Career Education and InterAmerica Research. The 16 National community organizations involved in this initial start up effort included:

(1) American Federation of Labor/Council of Industrial Organizations
(2) National Institute For Work and Learning
(3) National Alliance of Business
(4) Association of Junior Leagues
(5) 4-H
(6) National Association For Industry-Education Cooperation
(7) Chamber of Commerce of the United States
(8) Women's American ORT
(9) American Legion/American Legion Auxiliary
(10) Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.
(11) Junior Achievement, Inc.
(12) Boy Scouts of America
(13) Rotary, International
(14) National School Volunteer Program
(15) National Retired Teachers Association/American Association of Retired Persons
(16) National Center For Service-Learning

Each of these National organizations has affiliates – in the form of branches/chapters/units/members – at both the State and local levels. Obviously, much remains to be done before the "blueprints for action" formulated at the National level can filter down to State and local levels and be adapted at such levels for operational use. Just as obviously, the 16 National community

organizations represented in this initial implementation effort represent only a small portion of those who, in future years, should be included as "community partners in career education." In spite of all of this, it can be seen that, in 1980, career education's involvement with the local community is vastly different – and considerably greater – than it was when the career education movement first began in 1970.

Changes In The Role Of Classroom Teachers In Career Education

The crucial and central importance of the classroom teacher in the delivery of career education has remained an essential part of the bedrock of the career education concept during its first 10 years of existence. As we enter the decade of the 1980s, there is absolutely no indication that this condition will change. While, to be sure, the presence of special new courses/units in various aspects of career education grew during the decade of the 1970s, the primary means by which career education skills are delivered to students remains through infusion into the teaching/learning process. We have depended primarily on the current curriculum and the current teachers for implementation of career education. In this broad sense, one can see constancy, not change. Those who look more carefully at what teachers were asked to do in the name of career education, however, will quickly spot some very major changes that occurred during the decade of the 1970s. It is those changes that will be identified here.

In *Career Education: What It Is And How To Do It* published in 1972, the primary thing being asked of classroom teachers was to emphasize and make clear to students the career implications of their subject matter. There were strong statements made to teachers with reference to the importance of helping students understand that the instructional skills they are asked to learn in the classroom have clear utility in the occupational society. Implied in such statements was a promise that, if students understood the career implications of their subject matter, they would be motivated to learn more of that subject matter. Improvement in academic achievement was not, however, used as a primary vehicle for motivating teachers to insert a "careers" emphasis into the teaching/learning process. Instead, the primary appeal made to teachers was that students needed to understand those career implications so that they could better prepare themselves to take their place in the occupational society. A secondary emphasis, during the 1970–1973 period, was on urging teachers to infuse basic concepts of career development into the teaching/learning process. Neither of these emphases disappeared during the remainder of the decade. However, a host of other teacher roles were added to them.

In the USOE policy paper *An Introduction To Career Education* published in 1974, the K–12 teacher's role in career education was stated in the following manner:

"A. All classroom teachers will:

1. Devise and/or locate methods and materials designed to help pupils understand and appreciate the career implications of the subject matter being taught
2. Utilize career-oriented methods and materials in the instructional program, where appropriate, as one means of educational motivation
3. Help pupils acquire and utilize good work habits
4. Help pupils develop, clarify, and assimilate personally meaningful sets of work values
5. Integrate, to the fullest possible extent, the programmatic assumptions of career education into their instructional activities and teacher-pupil relationships

B. Some teachers, in addition, will be charged with:

1. Providing students with specific vocational competencies at a level that will enable them to gain entry into the occupational society
2. Help students acquire job-seeking and job-seeking skills
3. Participate in the job-placement process
4. Help students acquire decisionmaking skills"

Thus, it can be seen that, even as early as 1974, classroom teachers were being asked to expand their activities considerably beyond simply acquainting their students with the career implications of subject matter and basic career development concepts. A beginning had been made toward emphasizing some of what were later to be called the "10 career education skills." The reason why teacher role, in that publication, was divided into an "A" section and a "B" section was that, at that time, vocational education was still considered to be a component of career education. The "B" roles were being thought of as ones performed primarily by teachers of vocational education.

By 1977, when the USOE monograph *A Primer For Career Education* was published, the role of the classroom teacher in career education had been greatly expanded to include almost all of what are now known as the "10 career education skills." Included in the set of roles the teaching faculty is asked to play in career education were the following:

1. Seeking to improve academic achievement through using a "careers emphasis" as a vehicle to:
   a. Introduce a sense of purposefulness and meaningfulness into the teaching/learning process for both student and teacher through emphasizing that one of the reasons for learning the subject matter is that people use it in their work.
   b. Use a positive approach with students through rewarding students for what they have accomplished rather than emphasizing what they failed to accomplish, how much more they have to accomplish, or how many other students accomplished more. The basic idea is that, if we want students to strive harder to accomplish more, we can best do so by rewarding

and recognizing the accomplishments they have already made; i.e., the *work* they have done.

c. Introduce variety into the teaching/learning process through utilizing the personnel and physical resources of the broader community as *vehicles* for improving student achievement – for emphasizing that students can learn in more ways than simply through reading, in more places than the classroom, and from more persons than certified classroom teachers.

2. Consciously and conscientiously provide rewards to students who exhibit and practice such good work habits as: (a) coming to work (to school) on time; (b) completing assignments that are begun; (c) doing the best that they can; and (d) cooperating with one's fellow workers (students).
3. Combining a cognitive and experiential approach in the teaching/learning process through emphasizing the dual desirability of "doing to learn" and "learning to do."
4. Helping students acquire decision-making skills through using a project activity-oriented approach, when appropriate, in the teaching/learning process that allows students to actually *engage* in the decisionmaking process.
5. Systematically attempting to reduce biases students may have with respect to race, sex, or handicapping conditions in ways that will maximize freedom of choice for all persons.
6. Helping students discover ways in which the subject matter being learned can be valuable to students in productive use of leisure time.
7. Helping students discover and develop a personally meaningful set of work values through allowing them to observe, study, and discuss work values present among persons employed in various occupations.
8. Helping students become aware of and understand the basic nature of a variety of occupations while simultaneously helping students understand the educational requirements essential for success in them.
9. Helping students become more knowledgeable regarding the free enterprise system – including understandings of both economic education and of organized labor.
10. Helping students think about and consider possible career choices that may be possible for them and important to them.

Of the "10 career education skills" specified earlier, it will be noted that the only one omitted from this 1977 listing is the one concerned with job seeking/finding/getting/holding skills. The reason this skill was omitted from the 1977 listing was simply that it is *not* one that ALL teachers are asked to deliver. For example, we would not think this role appropriate for elementary school classroom teachers to play. Other than this one exception, it is obvious that the classroom teacher is, indeed, being asked to play a critical and

crucial role in the delivery of career education. The prime reason why this is so has to do with career education's goal of serving as a change agent in American Education. Were educational *change* not a basic underlying goal of career education, it is probable that classroom teachers, in general, would not be asked to play these 10 roles. Instead, we would have moved, during the decade, toward employing special "career education teachers" whose special assignment would be to provide students with these skills.

A second reason for assigning these roles to classroom teachers lies in the fact that, almost without exception, these skills are seen as ones best developed in a longitudinal fashion rather than at any particular grade level or point in time. In this regard, it should be noted that, during the entire decade of the 1970s, the career education movement has emphasized the importance of the elementary school — as well as secondary and postsecondary educational institutions — in the delivery of effective career education.

Three other factors, each related to reasons why the initial effort aimed at asking teachers to emphasize the career implications of their subject matter was increased to include the host of additional roles listed above are crucial to emphasize here. All three center around the importance of viewing career education as a vehicle for use in improving academic achievement in the classroom. They will be presented here in order of their appearance in the career education movement. First, it was clear by 1975 that, if teachers were to become active participants in career education, some kinds of tangible benefits to teachers, as well as to the students they serve, must become obvious. The clearest possible reward that could be offered teachers was to promise them that, if they use a "careers" approach to teaching, their students would learn more of the subject matter. Initially, this was used as an argument with those teachers who expressed objections to a "careers" approach as something that would take time away from teaching the subject matter itself. We emphasized to such teachers that, far from taking time away from imparting instructional skills per se, the "time" career education was asking for was the time any person who deserves to be called a "teacher" — as opposed to an "instructor" — takes to motivate his/her pupils to learn the subject matter. We were, of course, referring primarily, at that point, to the motivational impact being able to relate the subject matter with the occupational society would have on increasing pupil academic achievement. Some early evaluations of career education's effectiveness confirmed the reasonableness of this assumption while, in many other cases, we were unable to clearly demonstrate career education as a vehicle for use in increasing academic achievement.

Second, by 1977, it was obvious that our Nation's educational system was being caught in a "back to basics" cry — that parents, business/industry persons, and the general public were criticizing the Education system for too many "frills" and too little attention to what they called "the basics." At that point in time, career education was in danger of being labeled as one of the "frills" and people started asking the question "Should we emphasize 'career

education' or 'back to basics' in our school system?" Our answer was to picture career education, not as an alternative to the "back to basics" movement, but rather as a vehicle for use in attaining the goals of that movement. In order to justify that claim, it became obvious that much more than simply emphasizing the career implications of subject matter was needed. It was clear that, if academic achievement was to be improved, both the student *and* the teacher needed to be motivated to perform their assigned work. The student must be motivated to learn — *and* the teacher must be motivated to teach. The total set of "career education skills" was seen as central to achieving this joint motivation. If the list of 10 "teacher roles" reproduced above is examined, it can be seen that Skills 3 through 10 are largely oriented around attaining that objective. When teachers attempt all of these things, it was reasoned that chances of improving student academic achievement would be enhanced.

Third, by late 1978, I discovered, thanks to input received from many OCE miniconference participants, a much better rationale for Teacher Roles #1 and #2 in the above list. The rationale grew out of realization that career education could — and should — be seen, in part, as contributing toward making *productivity* a priority for America. Teacher Roles #1 and #2 had been developed, prior to 1977, through looking at the literature in industrial psychology related to increasing productivity that emphasized the importance of: (a) showing the worker the importance of his/her work in terms of some larger goal; (b) rewarding the worker whenever she/he really worked; (c) introducing variety into the workplace; and (d) emphasizing and rewarding the practice of good work habits. Teacher Roles #1 and #2 can easily be seen as simple adaptations of these four general approaches to the teaching/learning process. It was reasoned that, if these kinds of general procedures are effective in increasing productivity in industrial settings, so, too, should they be useful in increasing productivity in the classroom. Thus, it was easy, in late 1978, to mount a campaign emphasizing that, if productivity is to become a priority for America, it must certainly begin with increasing educational productivity in the formal Education system. When all 10 of these "teacher roles" specified in the "career education treatment" are properly applied, there seems little doubt but that academic achievement will be greater than would be the case were these 10 teacher roles to be ignored. Recent critics have pointed out that, when all 10 of these "teacher roles" are emphasized, there is very little difference between what career education asks teachers to do and what, in a generic sense, has always been known as "good teaching." The only obvious difference is that a "careers" approach — as opposed to some other approach — is being emphasized. To this kind of critic, I have tended to ask the simple question "What's wrong with good teaching?" That is, if a "careers" approach in the classroom can, in fact, result in better teaching, that, by itself, should be sufficient to justify continuation of the career education movement.

Throughout the decade of the 1970s, it was obvious, in community after community, that we were usually being much more successful in motivating

elementary school teachers to try a "careers" approach than we were in motivating secondary school teachers to do so. This was apparently due, in part, to the fact that elementary school teachers were much more used to and comfortable with using an activity-oriented approach to teaching. It was, in part, apparently due to the fact that elementary school teachers were, relatively speaking, more accustomed to using resource persons from the broader community in the classroom—and to taking students on field trips into the broader community. In part, the reluctance of many academic teachers in secondary school settings seemed to stem from a feeling that, if they used a "careers" emphasis in their classrooms, they would, in effect, become too much like teachers of vocational education—and that was something they didn't want to do. Finally, some secondary school teachers appeared to resist a "careers" approach to teaching because they feared it would take time away from emphasis on the instructional skills and knowledge they were trying to convey to their students. Such teachers raised the question of "Can it be done in Algebra I?"; "Can it be done in Biology?"; "Can it be done in American History?"—etc. In short, when the teacher was asked to insert a "careers" emphasis, the typical response was to react in terms of feasibility of such an approach for a specific subject matter area.

To help overcome this kind of resistance on the part of secondary school teachers, USOE's Office of Career Education awarded, in 1977-78, a series of contracts to a number of teacher associations, each of which was centered around a particular academic discipline. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics was already engaged in an independent project aimed at showing teachers of mathematics how to infuse a "careers" emphasis into their teaching and so found it unnecessary to respond to the Request for Proposals (RFP) issued at that time. Those professional teacher associations who did respond to that RFP included:

1. National Council of Teachers of English
2. National Council For Social Studies
3. National Science Teachers Association
4. National Art Education Association
5. National Business Education Association
6. American Association For Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance
7. American Council of Teachers of Foreign Language
8. Council For Exceptional Children

As part of the contract given each of the professional associations listed above, each proceeded to collect examples of how teachers in their individual academic disciplines were, in fact, successfully infusing a "careers" emphasis into the teaching/learning process. In addition, each professional association appointed key task forces to study the career education concept in depth and to make recommendations for its members regarding the applicability of career education to their particular academic discipline. As a final part of the contract, each of these professional teacher associations assembled their find-

ings and published them for their members in one or more publications. This was, obviously, simply a matter of using the "it takes one to sell one" approach to solving the problem – and it appears to be working well at the present time. Each of these professional teacher associations produced far more than I had any idea they would be able – or willing – to do with the very limited funds made available to them. My only regret is that we did not have funds, in the succeeding year, for use in helping each of these associations carry their projects a step further and involve State branches/chapters/affiliates in the process in a more active manner. If career education is now better accepted by secondary school academic teachers than it was at the beginning – and it definitely is – the major credit for this significant accomplishment must be given to each of these professional teacher associations.

There are now – and will probably always be – a certain percentage of classroom teachers who will resist "career education" or any other basic approach to educational change. This is due to what I have termed the "15-70-15 principle." That principle holds that, whenever any new sound approach to educational change is introduced to a group of teachers, it can be expected that: (a) about 15% will endorse it and enthusiastically seek out creative, innovative ways of applying it in their classrooms; (b) about 15% of teachers, no matter how good or worthwhile the idea, will resist it basically because they are opposed to *change* in any form; and (c) about 70% of teachers will, given sufficient time and study, adopt those portions of that "good idea" that they can see will improve their effectiveness in the classroom. That principle, so far as I can tell, appears to be operating in career education at the present time.

There is no doubt but that the decade of the 1970s saw major changes in the importance of the classroom teacher in the delivery of effective career education. Those changes started to occur when we began to realize that, in the total career education concept, the *teaching/learning process* is fully as important as is the *career development process*. This can be clearly seen in current practices that find teachers, in many settings, switching from their former emphasis on searching for ways to insert a "careers" emphasis into their already prepared lesson plans to an effort to incorporate a "careers" emphasis in the original development of teaching plans. The change has been gradual, sometimes difficult to see in dramatic ways, *but* extremely important to career education. Basically, it has been a change from the early 1970s when career education advocates were, in effect, seeking to "use" teachers to the present time when, in community after community, teachers are "using" career education.

Changes In Reduction of Bias And Stereotyping As A Career Education Goal

The 1972 publication *Career Education: What It Is And How To Do It* makes no specific mention of reduction of bias and stereotyping as a goal of

career education. As one of the four co-authors of that book—and speaking only for myself—I was not thinking of career education goals, at that time, as including one specific goal directed toward reduction of bias and stereotyping. Instead, by emphasizing repeatedly that career education is an effort designed to help ALL persons—females as well as males—persons with handicaps and persons without handicaps—minority persons and nonminority persons—the very young and the elderly—I assumed that readers would implicitly understand that we were concerned about the *entire* population including special segments of the population. In retrospect, it seems obvious that it was a serious conceptual error to make such an assumption.

By 1974, when the USOE policy paper *An Introduction To Career Education* appeared, two of the 11 conditions calling for educational reform stated in that document were directly related to this general topic including the following:

> "6. The growing need for and presence of women in the work force has not been reflected adequately in either the educational or the career options typically pictured for girls enrolled in our educational system."
>
> "10. American education, as currently structured, does not adequately meet the needs of minority or economically disadvantaged persons in our society."

These statements make clear the fact that a *part* of the problem of sex stereotyping (i.e., that part pertaining to girls and women) and the fact that minority persons do have special problems were recognized as part of the total set of statements used to justify the *need* for career education. No mention of bias/stereotyping problems related to persons with handicaps or to the concept of "ageism" appear in that document. Moreover, when, later in that publication, career education roles and responsibilities are listed, there is no specific mention whatsoever of such roles and responsibilities including those related to the goal of reducing bias and stereotyping. The closest thing to such specific mention is that classroom teacher role related to a request for teachers to integrate the "programmatic assumptions" of career education into their instructional activities and teacher-pupil relationships. Among the list of "programmatic assumptions" included in that document is one which states:

> "9. Occupational stereotyping hinders full freedom of occupational choice both for females and for minority persons. These restrictions can be reduced, to some extent, through programmatic intervention strategies begun in the early childhood years."

It seems unlikely that many persons, when studying the statements pertaining to teacher role and responsibilities in career education, actually went back and studied the "programmatic assumptions" carefully.

The 1977 USOE monograph *A Primer For Career Education* represents the first official U.S. Office of Education's Office of Career Education that "reduction of bias and stereotyping" is an explicit and important goal of career education. Several examples can be seen in the various role statements included in the "career education treatment." For example:

Classroom teachers are asked to:

"Systematically attempt to reduce biases students may have with respect to race, sex, or handicapping conditions in ways that will maximize freedom of choice for all persons."

Counseling and guidance personnel are asked to:

"Develop and promote a variety of educational and community actions and efforts aimed at reducing race, sex, and physical/mental handicapping conditions as deterrents to full freedom of educational and occupational choice for all persons."

Parents are asked to:

"Help their children develop attitudes devoid of bias with respect to race, sex, or physical/mental handicaps as deterrents to full freedom of educational and occupational choice for all persons."

In addition, among the 9 "learner outcomes" found in that document, there is one that states that career education seeks to produce individuals who, when they leave school (at any age or at any level) are:

9 "Aware of means available to themselves for changing career options—of societal and personal constraints impinging on career alternatives."

The above statement represents the first time an official policy statement of USOE's Office of Career Education recognized reduction of bias and stereotyping as a criterion appropriate for use in evaluating the effectiveness of a career education effort. It should be noted here that, of the 14 career education projects that successfully passed through the Department of Education's Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) with hard data, two have centered around demonstrating the effectiveness of career education in reducing bias and stereotyping in career development.

By 1978, when P.L. 95-207—"Career Education Incentive Act"—was passed, references to use of career education as a vehicle for reducing bias and stereotyping in the career development process were inserted at almost every conceivable point in that legislation. This action, to be best of my knowledge, was largely the result of efforts on the part of those whose primary concerns centered around sex bias and stereotyping. In 1979, USOE's Office of Career Education awarded a $400,000 contract—the second largest contract in its history—to the American Institutes For Research for a National project on the use of career education as a vehicle for reducing bias and stereotyping as a deterrent to full freedom of career choice for all persons. That project concerned itself with bias and stereotyping concerned with: (a) race; (b) sex; (c) handicapping conditions; and (d) age. It resulted in one National conference and a host of State/local conferences at which the topic was discussed and results from the AIR contract distributed. There is no doubt but that, by 1980, the goal of reducing bias and stereotyping in career development had become a major goal of the career education movement. As of 1980, when the 10 "career education skills" being championed by the Department of Education's Office of Career Education are listed, skills in reducing bias and stereotyping are listed as one of these ten *equally* important skills. Hopefully, this will put career education's emphasis in a proper perspective.

A retrospective view of the decade of the 1970s with respect to the topic of reducing bias and stereotyping in career development must certainly include at least brief observations regarding efforts and activities of persons, organizations, and agencies whose primary concerns lie, not with career education, but rather with special segments of the population to whom this topic holds particular signficance. Of these, organizations/agencies concerned primarily about persons with handicaps clearly stand out above all others in terms of the outstanding contributions they have made to providing effective career education for those they seek to serve. Two National conferences on career education for persons with handicaps have been held, one in 1973 and the second in 1978. In addition, special National conferences for persons with hearing handicaps have been held by Gallaudet College and by the National Technical Institute For The Deaf. The National Foundation For The Blind put the topic of "Career Education For Persons With Visual Handicaps" on its conference agenda for its 1980 Helen Keller Centennial Conference. A Division of Career Development, with a central concern for providing effective career education to persons with handicaps, has been formed within the Council For Exceptional Children (CEC) and produced some very major and significant publications and programs. Several experts on education of the handicapped have written books on the general topic of career education for persons with handicaps. The Council For Exceptional Children has produced four practitioner handbooks on career education for classroom teachers of persons with handicaps. With the emergence of Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs) for students with handicaps, there has been a pronounced movement, in many States, to include a "careers" component in the IEPs developed by teachers with individual students. Within the Federal Government, strong and consistent support for career education on behalf of persons with handicaps has been evident. In all of these ways—and more—the total career education movement has been greatly strengthened during the decade of the 1970s because of the interest, concern, support, and involvement of specialists in education of persons with handicaps. The record is very clear on this point.

Unfortunately, similar exemplary records of accomplishment in the area of career education cannot be given for organizations/agencies concerned primarily about either race bias or sex bias. Most of the efforts with respect to reduction of bias and stereotyping in career education efforts have come from those working primarily within the area of career education—not from those whose primary concerns are either race bias or sex bias. In the case of those National organizations/agencies whose primary concern is race bias and stereotyping, the most positive thing that can be said is that the serious objections to career education which some of them stated early in the decade of the 1970s have, for the most part, subsided. Initially, they were concerned that the career education movement might be used to track minority students into vocational education and into lower paid, less prestigious jobs in occupational society. When they recognized that career education, far from being an effort to "track" students and so narrow their options, was instead an effort to ex-

pand and broaden educational/career options for ALL persons—including minority persons—their earlier objections faded to a considerable extent. At the same time, there was no major National organization whose primary concern is reduction of racial bias and stereotyping that, during the decade of the 1970s, initiated a major independent effort to use career education as a vehicle for accomplishing that goal. This, of course, may have been due to the fact that they had available for use a host of other vehicles that they considered more powerful and effective. In part, the blame must be placed on those of us in career education for not more actively seeking the involvement of such organizations.

In the case of National organizations primarily concerned about reduction of sex bias and stereotyping, the primary efforts noted during the decade of the 1970s were directed toward ensuring that career education conceptualizers and practitioners developed and applied efforts aimed at solving this problem. These kinds of efforts have been strong and effective during almost the entire decade of the 1970s. At the same time, no single National organization/agency in this area has embraced career education as one of their significant action efforts on behalf of their own membership. They have not, to date, become active "partners" in career education in ways analogous to those demonstrated by organizations/agencies whose primary concerns center around meeting needs of persons with handicaps. It is not clear why this condition exists.

In retrospect, it is now abundantly clear that I was very wrong, in the early 1970s, to effectively ignore the importance of conceptualizing career education so that it included a pronounced emphasis on the use of career education as a vehicle for reducing bias and stereotyping. There were three major errors made initially. The first error I made was to assume that, by proclaiming career education as an effort to serve ALL persons, the special needs of women, minorities, and persons with handicaps would be met. It has become increasingly clear, during the decade of the 1970s, that large differences exist between providing "equality of opportunity" and providing "equity of opportunity" for special segments of the population. It is now clear that, while the career education movement continues to be concerned about ALL persons, special efforts must be made if career education needs of women, minorities, persons with handicaps, and the economically disadvantaged are to be met.

The second error I made was in failing to recognize that the goal of reducing bias and stereotyping as a deterrent to full freedom of career choice, while holding special significance for these special segments of the total population, could be met only if that goal is applied to career education efforts for ALL persons. That is, actions aimed at reducing bias and stereotyping cannot be realistically limited only to those who suffer directly from it. Rather, this goal is one that must be included in the career education treatment for all persons.

The third error I made was in failing to recognize—and act—upon the tremendously powerful potential career education has for serving as a vehicle for use in reducing occupational bias and stereotyping in society in general

and in the Education system in particular. The longitudinal developmental nature of career education, its emphasis on changing attitudes and actions of ALL educators, its emphasis on community/education "partnerships," and its emphasis on both paid and unpaid work each represents a potentially very powerful way of contributing to reduction of bias and stereotyping in our society. This, too, is as clear in 1980 as it was vague in 1970.

Changes In The Kinds And Magnitude Of Change Called For By Career Education

It is much easier to talk about the need for "change" than it is to make it happen. My initial interest in the term "career education," when Commissioner Marland first spoke of it in 1970, grew out of my 22 previous years as a professional educator whose primary concerns were in the domain of career development. My initial goal was to use the career education movement as a means of changing both the education system *and* the occupational society in ways that would maximize the career development of all persons. When, in my first definition of "career education," I defined it in terms of making work "possible, meaningful, and satisfying" to all persons, that was exactly what I meant. I even thought briefly, in 1970, about trying to change the term from "career education" to "career development education," but soon gave that up as a task I could not accomplish.

Thus, it should surprise no one to see many of these broader calls for change reflected in the 1972 book *Career Education: What It Is And How To Do It*. The basic concerns I expressed in that book included: (a) concern over the false societal attitude that worships a college degree as the best and surest route to occupational success; (b) concern for recognizing that the optimum kind and amount of education required as preparation for work will vary from occupation to occupation – and from person to person; (c) concern for judging the worth of an occupation more in terms of its societal contributions than in the amount of education required to enter it; (d) concern for making "preparation for work" a major goal of all who teach and all who learn; and (e) concern for inserting a more pronounced emphasis on *goals* – i.e., on basic reasons for learning – into the entire fabric of American Education.

Such concerns led me to propose several basic kinds of educational change to be championed by the career education movement in that 1972 book including:

1. Elimination of academic credits and degrees as an absolute necessity for professional advancement of educators through adding some alternative routes to acquisition of competence that can be recognized and rewarded.
2. Greater public involvement in basic educational policymaking through a more representative manner of electing school board members.

3. Helping ALL educators rid themselves of the false attitude that a college degree represents an ultimately desirable goal for all persons.
4. Increasing our emphasis on "accomplishment" and decreasing our emphasis on "time" as a prime criterion for use in measuring educational accomplishment – i.e., a move toward performance evaluation and away from sole use of Carnegie credits.
5. Extending the concept of the ungraded school to all of American education in ways that would create a true open entry/open exit system – thus eliminating the concept of the "school dropout."
6. Creation of the year round school that would, among other things, (a) allow for multiple graduation dates during a 12-month period; (b) allow students to combine work and education in ways most beneficial for them; (c) allow teachers sabbaticals to acquire experience in the broader occupational society through exchange systems with personnel from business and industry – and many other things as well.
7. Opening up public school facilities for 18 hours per day 6 days per week under conditions where adults, as well as youth, could make maximum use of such facilities.
8. Unifying the current educational system, remedial manpower training system, and welfare system into a single unified system built around the career development needs of all persons – youth and adults.

Among the kinds of basic changes I initially envisioned the career education movement making in the occupational society itself were the following:

1. Creation of educational sabbaticals for employed workers that would allow each to acquire additional skills, knowledge, and understanding needed to optimize their career development.
2. Creation of conditions that would allow workers to experience more variety – and so less boredom – in their work through equipping each to perform a number of different kinds of work assignments.
3. Humanizing the workplace in ways that allow each worker to see more clearly the importance of the tasks she/he is performing – and so gain a greater sense of meaningfulness and satisfaction from the work each does.

Those viewing the above list of major changes advocated early in the career education movement should do so recognizing that a Federal expenditure from six billion to ten billion dollars was proposed as the minimum amount required to make these changes. Obviously, during the decade of the 1970s, no one saw fit to take those funding recommendations – and so this total set of proposed changes – seriously.

By 1974, when the USOE policy paper *An Introduction To Career Education* was published, the basic concept of the need for broader changes in American Education extending far beyond simple implementation of a career education effort was retained. That document presented the following list of basic educational policy changes as ones being championed by the career education movement:

1. Substantial increases in the quantity, quality, and variety of vocational education offerings at the secondary school level and of occupational education offerings at the postsecondary school level.
2. Increases in the number and variety of educational course options available to students with a de-emphasis on the presence of clearly differentiated college preparatory, general education, and vocational education curriculums at the secondary school level.
3. The installation of performance evaluation, as an alternative to the strict time requirements imposed by the traditional Carnegie unit, as a means of assessing and certifying educational accomplishment.
4. The installation of systems for granting educational credit for learning that takes place outside the walls of the school.
5. Increasing use of noncertificated personnel from the business-industry-labor community as educational resource persons in the educational system's total instructional program.
6. The creation of an open entry-open exit educational system that allows students to combine schooling with work in ways that fit their needs and educational motivations.
7. Substantial increases in programs of adult and recurrent education as a responsibility of the public school educational system.
8. Creation of the year-round public school system that provides multiple points during any 12-month period in which a student will leave the educational system.
9. Major overhaul of teacher education programs and graduate programs in education aimed at incorporating the career education concepts, skills, and methodologies.
10. Substantial increases in the career guidance, counseling, placement, and followup functions as parts of American education.
11. Substantial increases in program and schedule flexibility that allow classroom teachers, at all levels, greater autonomy and freedom to choose educational strategies and devise methods and materials they determine to be effective in increasing pupil achievement.
12. Increased utilization of educational technology for gathering, processing, and disseminating knowledge required in the teaching-learning process.
13. Increased participation by students, teachers, parents, and members of the business-industry-labor community in educational policy-making.
14. Increased participation by formal educational institutions in comprehensive community educational and human service efforts.

That document, like the 1972 publication, recognized that the dollar costs required for making these major kinds of basic educational change would be great. It contended, however, that such funds could be found in remedial and alternative educational systems that, supported with tax dollars, now exist outside the structure of the formal Education system. It was a major plea to

avoid, in the United States, a dual system of Education supported by tax dollars—one for those that can make it as the Education system is currently structured and the other for those who cannot successfully make it in an Education system that continues to ignore the call for these basic kinds of educational reform. Obviously, the recent rapid increase in billions of dollars available for programs such as CETA, coupled with failure to provide dollars for the kinds of educational reforms advocated in the 1974 document, makes it clear that the kinds of basic education changes being proposed has, for the most part, been effectively ignored.

By 1977, when the USOE policy document entitled *A Primer For Career Education* was published, it was clear to me that we were having enough trouble simply trying to get the basic kinds of attitudinal/philosophical changes required to implement the career education concept—let alone secure the more far reaching kinds of educational change called for in the earlier publications. Therefore, in that document, rather than continue to talk about the broader set of basic changes outlined in the earlier publications, I limited the changes called for to the following:

FROM an assumption that says:	TO an assumption that says:
1. General education alone is the best preparation for work.	1. Both general education and a set of specific marketable vocational skills are increasingly necessary as preparation for work.
2. Youth is that period of life in which one prepares for work.	2. Most individuals will find it increasingly necessary to combine education and work during large portions of their adult lives.
3. American education has attained the goal of preparation for work when it has prepared school leavers to enter the world of paid employment.	3. The goal of education as preparation for work must include an emphasis on preparing school leavers to change with change in the world of paid employment.
4. The best way to prepare youth for the world of paid employment is to lock them up in a school house and keep them away from that world.	4. Both the world of schooling and the world of paid employment must become part of the student's real world.
5. The more years one spends in school the better equipped he/she is for work.	5. The optimum kind and amount of education required as preparation for work will vary widely from occupation to occupation.
6. Jobs choose people—people don't choose jobs.	6. It is important that student self understanding and understanding of the world of paid employment be emphasized in ways that allow students to have maximum control over their own destinies.
7. The very best educational and occupational opportunities should be reserved for white, able-bodied males.	7. The full range of educational and occupational opportunities must be made available, to the greatest possible extent, to minority persons, handicapped persons, and women as well as to all others in society.

8. The goal of education as preparation for work should be directed exclusively toward the world of paid employment.	8. The goal of education as preparation for work must include unpaid work performed as well as work in the world of paid employment.
9. The goal of education as preparation for employment should be primarily concerned with JOBS.	9. Education as preparation for employment should be concerned with WORK as well as with JOBS.

It will be obvious that, when the list presented above is compared with the earlier sets of educational changes advocated in the 1974 and 1972 publications, that I limited those changes to ones where a bonafide comprehensive career education effort could make some observable difference. The basic notion of viewing career education as a vehicle for use in attaining educational change is still present, but the magnitude of proposed change was reduced. My decision to move in this direction was, in no way, a matter of having changed my mind regarding the desirability of a much broader set of changes in American education. Rather, it simply reflected what, by 1977, had become a more realistic perception of what changes career education could, in fact, help bring about. My personal commitment to the desirability of each of the broader kinds of change remains as strong now as it was when I proposed them in the early part of the decade of the 1970s.

Changes In Federal Support For Career Education

The decade of the 1970s began with career education being declared the top priority of the United States Office of Education. The decade ended with career education being a very low priority item within the Federal Government's Department of Education. While factual, the preceding two statements do not accurately reflect what happened to the career education movement during the decade of the 1970s. For example, Brodinsky (Brodinsky, Ben "Something Happened: Education In The Seventies" *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1979, *61*, 238-241), in summarizing major educational events of the decade, described career education as "the modest success story of the 70s." A National survey of school board members and superintendents conducted in 1979 by the National School Boards Association found "career education" to be the single "new topic" of the 1970s that both school board members and superintendents felt most deserving of increased attention in their school districts. (National School Boards Association "What Priorities For Global Education?" An NSBA Survey Of School Board Members and School Superintendents. Washington, D.C.: National School Boards Association, 1980.) It seems safe to say that career education did survive the decade of the 1970s. At this point, it may be instructive to review briefly the pattern of Federal financial support given career education during the decade of the 1970s.

The decade began with almost exclusive use of discretionary funds available under Part D of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. Between 1970 and 1976, a total of 124 K-12 career education demonstration

funds were provided under this legislation costing a total of $47.0 million dollars. Additionally, between 1971 and 1975, a total of $24.6 million dollars were made available by the National Institute of Education to fund four major kinds of career education "models" under 12 projects (including a "school based model," an "employer based model" – later to be called "experienced based career education," a "home based model," and a "residential model"). Added to this was $18.0 million dollars to fund an additional 112 K-12 career education demonstration projects between 1972-1975 using funds from Part C of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. This, then, totalled $89.6 million dollars of Federal funds being spent on career education demonstration projects during the 1970-1975 period when no funds had been expressly appropriated by the Congress for this purpose. The funds being used were primarily discretionary funds.

In 1974, the Congress enacted, as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1974, Section 406 – "Career Education." This marked the first time the Congress had specifically authorized the use of Federal funds for career education. Section 406 provided funds only for purposes of *demonstrating* the effectiveness of career education – not funds for *implementing* it on a Nationwide basis. During the period beginning with Fiscal Year 1975 and continuing through Fiscal Year 1978, a total of $40,404,429 dollars was expended under provisions of this legislation. These funds supported a total of 425 career education demonstration projects with the funds being allocated as follows:

	No. of Projects	Dollar Amount
Category 1 – Demonstrations of incremental improvements in K-12 career education efforts	111	$12,945,393
Category 2A – Demonstrations of career education in senior high school settings	10	992,636
Category 2B – Demonstrations of career education in community college settings	8	899,366
Category 2C – Demonstrations of career education in adult and community education settings	8	739,858
Category 2D – Demonstrations of career education in institutions of higher education	11	1,012,651
Category 3A – Demonstrations of career education for persons with handicaps	21	2,078,811
Category 3B – Demonstrations of career education for gifted and talented persons	17	1,055,832
Category 3C – Demonstrations of career education for minority youth	13	1,102,319
Category 3D – Demonstrations of career education for low-income youth	11	1,422,588
Category 3E – Demonstrations of effective techniques to reduce sex stereotyping in career choices	14	994,248
Category 4 – Demonstrations of effective techniques for training and retraining persons (primarily teacher education)	41	4,977,480

Category 5 — Demonstrations of communicating career education concepts to practitioners and to the general public	59	7,433,704
Category 6A — Conducting a survey of current status of career education in the U.S.A.	1	308,640
Category 6B — Develop ng State plans for implementing career education	100	4,440,905
TOTALS	425	$40,404,429

The use of the 6 major categories reported above — and the relative amount of funding allocated to each — bears directly on what happened to career education during the decade of the 1970s. Category 1 ($12,945,393), aimed at demonstrating the effectiveness of career education in comprehensive K-12 efforts, was most directly related to the purposes of Section 406 as stated by the Congress. Thus, it deserved — and received — the largest amount of funds and the greatest number of projects of any of the six categories. Results from this category were most instrumental in passage of P.L. 95-207 — "Career Education Incentive Act" — in 1978. Category 2 ($3,644,511) was used in order to make a beginning effort to illustrate and encourage the concept of career education as an effort that extended beyond the K-12 setting to all of postsecondary education. The senior high school subcategory used here was judged to be necessary because of the fact that we had been relatively more successful in elementary school than secondary school career education efforts. Because this legislation was a part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1974, I felt that, in spite of the great importance of the area, this was as much as we could afford to invest in funding demonstration projects in Category 2.

Category 3 ($6,653,798) represented a strong attempt to study and to demonstrate the kinds of career education efforts needed to meet the needs of special segments of the population. Category 3A (for persons with handicaps) received roughly twice as much funding as any other subcategory in this area due to the fact that the Congress specifically demanded, in enacting Section 406, that special attention should be directed toward this portion of the total population.

Category 4 ($4,977,480) reflected my belief that the importance of changing teacher attitudes was crucial in the implementation of career education. Further, it seemed obvious to me that, in the long run, serious attempts must be made to do so through changes in pre-service teacher education programs. To depend only on inservice education efforts did not seem to represent a wise strategy to adopt. Thus, funds in this category were used for purposes of trying to demonstrate the efficacy of infusing a career education emphasis into teacher preparation programs. As a demonstration effort, it appeared to be successful. In terms of influencing common practices in teacher education institutions, it was not very successful.

Category 5 ($7,433,704), in my opinion, provided the career education movement with a greater return, per dollar invested, than any other single category. It was this category that was used to: (a) initiate involvement of Na-

tional community organizations in career education; (b) encourage professional educational associations to become involved in studying and recommending career education to their members; (c) fund several National dissemination efforts—including both the Commissioner's National Conference On Career Education (held during November 1976 in Houston, Texas) and activities of the National Center For Career Education at the University of Montana; and (d) fund all Office of Career Education "mini-conferences" held during the 1974-1978 period.

Category 6 ($4,749,543) was legislatively mandated as part of Section 406. It resulted in the first National survey of the status of career education—a document that will have no counterpart until September 1982. It also resulted in providing two years of funding to each State Department of Education for purposes of constructing individual State plans for implementing career education. This, in turn, allowed State Coordinators of Career Education to be employed and to build, in each State, a readiness to implement career education in K-12 settings on a Statewide basis.

During this same period (1974-1978), a special study conducted, at the request of Congress, by the Congressional Budget Office estimated that over $100 million dollars per year was being spent on various kinds of career education projects by other parts of the United States Office of Education. These included projects funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act's Title IV-C, the Bureau of Education For The Handicapped, the Women's Equity Program, the Fund For the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, and the Bureau of Postsecondary Education. Thus, the total amount of Federal dollars spent by such Bureaus *each year* exceeded the total amount of Federal vocational education funds used to support career education demonstration projects during the entire 1970-76 period.

In 1978, the Congress enacted Public Law 95-207—"Career Education Incentive Act" with almost unanimous votes in both the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate. This was a most unusual piece of legislation in several ways, each of which deserves brief mention here. First, it was, so far as I can tell, the *only* piece of categorical educational legislation passed by the Congress during the decade of the 1970s. All others were part of some form of omnibus education legislation. Second, this legislation was truly written in an "incentive"—rather than in a "mandate"—tone. It forced no State, local school district, or postsecondary educational institution to do *anything* in career education. Instead, funds provided under this Act were specifically aimed at providing assistance to those parts of Education who had decided, on their own, to embrace the career education concept. This was a most significant characteristic indeed—and one that appears to have been missed by many persons.

Third, the Congress, in enacting this legislation, took full cognizance of results obtained from the many demonstration projects funded under provisions of Section 406 mentioned above. Because of this, the Congress divided the Act into two major sections, one designed to provide assistance to those

desiring to *implement* career education in K-12 settings and the other to provide assistance to those desiring to *demonstrate* career education in post-secondary and adult education settings. Separate authorization provisions were made for each of these two major sections of this Act.

Fourth—and perhaps most significant—the Congress wrote this Act as a piece of "sunset" legislation designed to operate from 1979 through 1983 and then go out of existence. The rationale used by the Congress was simple and straightforward; namely (a) the Congress intended that the implementation of career education, at the K-12 level, should be primarily a State and local school district responsibility with Federal funds being available only for purposes of getting that effort started; and (b) comprehensive demonstrations of career education at the postsecondary level would provide Congress, by 1983, with a firm basis for determining whether or not to fund further career education legislation aimed at assisting in career education implementation efforts at the postsecondary level.

In keeping with the rationale cited above, the Congress authorized varying amounts for the K-12 portion of the Act each year and a flat amount of $15.0 million dollars each year for the postsecondary demonstration section. Congressional *appropriations*, as compared with *authorizations*, for the first three years were:

	Congressional Authorization		Congressional Appropriation	
Year	K-12 portion	Postsecondary	K-12 portion	Postsecondary Portion
FY 79	$50.0 M.	$15.0 M.	$20.0 M.	ZERO
FY 80	$100.0 M.	$15.0 M.	$15.0 M.	ZERO
FY 81	$100.0 M.	$15.0 M.	$15.0 M.	ZERO (tentative figures)
FY 82	$50.0 M.	$15.0 M.	—	— (to be determined)
FY 83	$25.0 M.	$15.0 M.	—	— (to be determined)

Under provisions of the K-12 portion of P.L. 95-207, 92.5% of funds appropriated by the Congress are to be distributed to participating State Departments of Education, on a formula grant basis determined by the number of children Ages 5-18 in each State. A minimum of $125,000 is, by law, required to be made available to each State no matter how few children it has. Each participating State Department of Education, in turn, is required under this law to distribute a minimum of 85% of the funds it receives to local K-12 school districts on a grant basis. Thus, it is obvious that the Congress intended that career education be implemented, at the K-12 level, through requiring that most of the appropriated funds reach local K-12 school districts.

Furthermore, P.L. 95-207 requires that, while Federal funds may be used to pay 100% of this K-12 implementation effort in 1979 and 1980, a combination of State and local funds must be mixed with the Federal funds in such a way that Federal funds pay no more than 75% of the costs in 1981, 50% of the costs in 1982, and 25% of the costs in 1983—the last year of the Act. This is one more clear indication of the intent of Congress to make the

implementation of K-12 career education efforts a State and local—rather than a Federal—responsibility by no later than 1983.

The Federal role, under P.L. 95-207 is primarily one of providing: (a) conceptual/catalytic leadership; (b) assurances to Congress that Federal funds are expended in accordance with requirements of the law; and (c) technical assistance to State Departments of Education. State Departments of Education, in turn, are to play a professional leadership/monitoring/technical assistance role with local school districts in each State. It is the local K-12 school districts who, under this law, have the major operational responsibility for actually implementing K-12 career education efforts.

It is too early to tell if the intent of Congress, as expressed in the wording of P.L. 95-207, will actually be met. With current appropriations, as noted above, running far less than the authorized amounts, there remains some doubt as to whether implementation effort envisioned by the Congress can be achieved by the end of 1983 when this legislation is due to expire. Still, preliminary findings are encouraging. First, as of the end of 1980, 47 of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territories are still voluntarily participating in implementing this legislation. Only three States—South Dakota, Nevada, and New Mexico—have, to date, elected not to participate. Each participating State has written a State Plan that includes specific objectives to be attained—and criteria for assessing each objective—during each of the 5 years the Act is due to operate. Each has appointed, as required by this law, a State Coordinator of Career Education who is "experienced in career education."

Preliminary indications that these State Coordinators of Career Education are following congressional intent in using these funds for State leadership activities and for making grants to local school districts are also encouraging. In October 1980, the American Institutes of Research, under contract with the U.S. Department of Education, submitted a "rapid feedback evaluation" report based on a sample of 9 States participating under the Act. While not a random sample—and so not generalizable to the entire Nation—there are some encouraging findings found in this AIR report including, for example, the following:

State Level Results (for 9 States)

1. 6 Chief State School officers had actively promoted career education
2. 5 State legislatures had passed laws of endorsement
3. 7 States had appropriated State funds to help implement career education
4. In 7 States, business/labor/industry/professional/community organizations were involved in the implementation of career education
5. All 9 States reported K-12 career education implementation efforts have increased since P.L. 95-207 funds had become available

Local Level Results (for 9 States)

1. Of the total career education budget, only an average of 38% came from 95-207 funds with the remainder coming from other sources
2. Of local school districts funded with 95-207 funds
    a. All of the superintendents and ¾ of the school boards had endorsed career education
    b. All but 5 had made systematic efforts to reduce bias and stereotyping in students' career planning
    c. Roughly 58% of teachers were estimated to be using a "careers" emphasis in their classrooms on a regular basis
    d. 62% of elementary school counselors and 78% of secondary school counselors were actively supporting career education implementation
    e. 65% reported existence of a "Career Education Action Council" with representatives from broad segments of the community

Based on findings such as these—and many, many more found in this report, the AIR authors concluded that:

> "While the results of this brief evaluation cannot be generalized to the country as a whole, it is apparent that PL 95-207 funds *are* serving the purposes envisioned by Congress when it passed the Incentive Act."

This positive conclusion was tempered by the authors with notations indicating that much remains to be done especially in areas such as: (1) evaluating career education through formal studies; (2) involving organized labor in career education; (3) emphasizing preservice education in career education for prospective teachers; and (4) active involvement of organizations representing special needs populations.

In summary, it can be said that, while the Federal interest in career education has remained strong during the entire decade of the 1970s, the Federal intent has been clearly one of making the implementation of career education a State and local—rather than a Federal—responsibility. It is, as of now, still too early to tell the extent to which this Federal intent will, in fact, be carried out.

Changes In Career Education/Organized Labor Relationships

No summary of significant changes in the conceptualization of career education during the decade of the 1970s would be complete if it failed to recognize the major contributions organized labor has made to such changes. Many representatives from organized labor have helped greatly in refining and expanding the career education concept during the decade of the 1970s. Their contributions have grown largely out of discussions I have had with them concerning the reservations organized labor had with the career education concept as originally presented in the early 1970s. Here, an attempt will be made to identify each of organized labor's concerns and how, with the help

of representatives from organized labor, those expressed concerns have led to significant changes in the career education concept itself.

The concern expressed by organized labor was that career education might result in an effort to encourage the sons and daughters of union members to enroll in trade/vocational training programs rather than seeking college admission. That concern was, in part, responsible for refining the career education concept in ways that make it abundantly clear that career education seeks to expand — not restrict — both the educational and career options available for consideration on the part of ALL persons.

A second concern of organized labor, initially, was that career education might result in an overemphasis on the goal of education as preparation for work — and so an underemphasis on the other important basic goals of American Education. That concern has led to career education conceptual efforts aimed at making it clear to all concerned that career education seeks to change American Education in ways that bring a more *proper* and *appropriate* emphasis to the goal of education as preparation for work in ways that neither demean nor detract from any other basic goal of Education.

Closely related has been organized labor's concern for making sure that the American system of public education give a strong emphasis to the basic academic skills. No one knows better than members of organized labor how important such skills are in the occupational society. This concern of organized labor was, in part, responsible for career education's attempts, during the decade of the 1970s, to produce hard evidence demonstrating that career education — far from being a competitor of the "back to basics" movement — is, in fact, a vehicle useful for helping students acquire basic academic skills.

Fourth, organized labor expressed strong opposition, in the early 1970s, to what they perceived as career education's attempts to — as one of them said to me — "put Milton Friedman in the classroom." This was a reaction to career education's early efforts to bring persons from the occupational society into classrooms as resource persons and to take students on field trips into the occupational society. Organized labor noted that, while employers were free to visit classrooms, union members were often not allowed time off to do so — unless their pay was docked. Additionally, organized labor noted that, while field trips often included a short visit to the corporate executive offices, they rarely, if ever, included a visit to the local AFL/CIO labor council. The concern was, simply put, that, if students are to hear the views of management, so, too, should they hear the views of organized labor. Great progress has been made, during the decade of the 1970s, in changing career implementation practices in ways that overcome this objection.

Fifth, representatives from organized labor have made major contributions to refinement of the career education concept in the area of work experience. In the beginning, organized labor expressed opposition to career education including a work experience component. In part, their objections were based on existing child labor and health/safety laws and regulations that would prevent work experience opportunities from being made available in large parts

of the occupational society. In part, they objected to the basic concept of providing students with work experience in actual occupational settings as part of career education. Their fears were based on: (a) a concern that this might lead to some form of subminimum wage; and (b) a concern that employers might find it less expensive to hire youth than adults—and so cause some adults to lose their jobs. Representatives from organized labor contributed greatly, during the decade of the 1970s, to refining the concept of work experience in career education in ways that make its primary purpose career exploration—not productivity for the employer. This, in turn, has led to refining the concept of work experience in career education so that it is, for most students, now unpaid work rather than any form of paid employment. I consider this to be a major contribution of organized labor in refining the career education concept.

Sixth, representatives from organized labor have made major contributions in defining what teachers and students should know about organized labor and how such information can best be conveyed. In this sense, the contribution has been relatively more to the implementation than to the conceptualization of career education. Without the willingness of organized labor to provide this kind of expert consultation and assistance, the implementation of career education would be far less than it is at the present time.

Organized labor has done much more than simply contribute to refining the concept of career education. Both the United Autoworkers of America and the United Rubber, Cork, and Linoleum Workers of America have issued policy statements endorsing the career education concept. Organized labor played a major role in making program presentations at the Commissioner's National Conference On Career Education held in 1976—including one of the three keynote addresses to that Conference. Representatives from organized labor have participated in two OCE "miniconferences" aimed at providing me with advice and consultation. Organized labor has been most helpful to several OCE funded career education projects—especially Akron, Ohio and Red Oak, Iowa—in developing career education materials expressing the views of organized labor. The AFL/CIO participated as one of 16 major National community organizations in OCE's 1979-80 effort to promote "community partnerships" in career education. The AFL/CIO has, in recent years, been a powerful and influential force in obtaining Federal funds from the Congress in terms of appropriations for career education. During 1980, Dr. Walter Davis—currently Director of Community Affairs in the AFL/CIO—served with distinction as Chair of the National Advisory Council On Career Education. It was the AFL/CIO who was most instrumental in making sure that, when P.L. 95-207—"Career Education Incentive Act"—was written, it mandated the presence of at least one representative from organized labor on the National Advisory Council On Career Education.

Two USOE publications exist that will provide interested readers with a deeper understanding of the significant contributions organized labor has made—and can make—to the career education movement. One, entitled

Career Education and Organized Labor was published in 1979 and includes three major sections: (a) a keynote speech presented by Mr. Peter S. Nommstiyo, President of the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Tile Workers, at the Commissioner's National Conference On Career Education in 1976; (b) a comprehensive conceptual paper on the role and function of organized labor in career education written by Professor Mark Schulman, Antioch College, under contract with the National Advisory Council on Career Education; and (c) a summary of thoughts and recommendations of key representatives from organized labor made during "miniconferences" that I conducted with them. That document is worthy of study.

The second significant USOE publication regarding organized labor is one written for the U.S. Department's Office of Career Education, under contract, by Mr. Nicholas J. Topougis, Career Education Coordinator for the Akron, Ohio public schools. That document, entitled *Labor And Career Education: Ideas For Action*, contains a wealth of basic information regarding organized labor useful to educators interested in including this topic in their career education efforts along with a set of suggested lesson plans for doing so. It is basically a "how to" kind of publication.

As we enter the decade of the 1980s, it seems to me that we do so having organized labor emerging as an active "partner" in the effort. While still far from being a totally accomplished fact, significant beginnings have been made. The ways in which involvement of organized labor in career education have been described in this section are a good illustration of a basic principle that has guided the evolving career education movement during the entire decade of the 1970s; namely, if it is considered desirable to enlist the participation of a particular segment of society in the *implementation* of career education, it is essential that we allow and encourage that segment of society to also be involved in the *conceptualization* of career education. It is that principle that has been illustrated here.

Changes In Involvement of Postsecondary Education In Career Education

From the beginning, career education has been conceptualized as an effort designed to be applied over the entire lifespan – from the early pre-school years through the retirement years. That basic emphasis has remained strong and consistent during the entire decade of the 1970s. It can be seen in the 1972 book *Career Education: What It Is And How To Do It*, in the 1974 USOE publication *An Introduction To Career Education*, and in the 1977 USOE policy statement *A Primer For Career Education*. In all three of these basic documents, strong statements are made supporting the presence of a career education effort in such diverse postsecondary education settings as community colleges, four year college/university settings, and in various forms of adult/continuing education. The conceptual emphasis is clear and consistent.

Other publications from the U.S. Government Printing Office appearing during the decade of the 1970s are also illustrative of this continuing emphasis. Such publications include:

(1) Olson, Paul A. *The Liberal Arts And Career Education.* 1975.

(2) Goldstein, Michael B. *The Current State Of Career Education At The Postsecondary Level.* 1977.

(3) Valley, John R. *Career Education Of Adults.* 1977.

(4) Sexton, Robert F. *Experiential Education And Community Involvement Practices At The Postsecondary Level: Implications for Career Education.* 1977.

(5) Hoyt, K. B. *Application Of The Concept of Career Education To Higher Education: An Idealistic Model.* 1976.

(6) Hoyt, K. B. *Considerations Of Career Education In Postsecondary Education.* 1978.

Three of the publications cited above – those written by (a) Goldstein; (b) Valley; and (c) Sexton – were commissioned by the National Advisory Council On Career Education in 1976 and are illustrative of the continuing interest and concern of the NACCE in career education efforts at the postsecondary/adult education levels. It was NACCE's interest in this matter that, in part, resulted in inclusion of a postsecondary demonstration section (Section 11) of the "Career Education Incentive Act." Since that Act – P.L. 95-207 – was passed, the NACCE has expressed strong and consistent support for funding of Section 11 – including a special set of hearings held in 1980 where the views of several segments of postsecondary education were heard.

As was noted in an earlier section of this chapter, a total of 27 demonstration projects costing $2,651,875 were conducted during the period 1974-1978 using funds from Section 406, P.L. 93-380. This effort was made in spite of the fact that law was a part of the Amendments To The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1974. It is thus considered illustrative of the strong interest of USOE's Office of Career Education to postsecondary/adult education during that period of time. The 27 projects funded during that period included one aimed specifically at demonstrating the efficacy of implementing career education in a comprehensive fashion at a major State university (University of Alabama) and two demonstration projects – each using a different basic model – for implementing comprehensive career education efforts at 4-year liberal arts colleges (Livonia College and Alma College – both Michigan institutions). Both of these efforts culminated in a National Conference On Career Education In Liberal Arts Colleges attended by representatives from over 100 such colleges.

The decade of the 1970s also saw major efforts on the part of a number of professional associations from postsecondary education that were aimed at promoting the concept of career education in postsecondary education. These efforts included: (a) two National conferences – and a series of regional conferences – on career education sponsored by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges; (b) two National conferences and creation

of a Career Education Task Force by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities; (c) a very active Career Education Task Force appointed by the Adult Education Association/USA; (d) a series of regional conferences on career education, along with a National conference sponsored by the American Association of Colleges For Teacher Education; (e) a very active effort to study and publicize career education on the part of the College Placement Council; (f) strong statements of support for career education in postsecondary education from the American College Personnel Association; and (g) creation of a career education effort aimed at implementing a policy resolution supporting career education by the National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons (NRTA/AARP)—with that unit being established in the Institute of Lifetime Learning of NRTA/AARP. Actions such as these clearly illustrate both the interest in and the involvement of the postsecondary education community itself in career education during the decade of the 1970s.

All of the actions mentioned in this section undoubtedly contributed to the fact that a special section calling for intensive demonstrations of career education at the postsecondary education level—authorized for a total of $75.0 million dollars over a 5-year period—was included in P.L. 95-207—"Career Education Incentive Act"—when that legislation became law in 1978. Among those who contributed to making this legislation a reality, two persons deserve special mention for the historical record. One is Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr. who, during his entire tenure on the National Advisory Council On Career Education, worked hard for passage of this section of the law. The second is Senator William D. Hathaway (Maine) who served as the chief architect for this section of the law in the Congress. Had Senator Hathaway not left the United States Senate in 1978, it seems highly probable that some congressional appropriations would have been made for Section 11 of P.L. 95-207 during FY 1979 and FY 1980. As things now stand, the Congress has yet to appropriate any funds for this section of the Career Education Incentive Act.

As we enter the decade of the 1980s, the future of career education at the postsecondary/adult education levels is unclear. There is absolutely no doubt but that the concept of career education is at least as much needed—and at least as applicable—at the postsecondary level as at the K-12 level. The need for a clear "careers" emphasis in postsecondary education has become increasingly obvious during the decade of the 1970s. This is seen both in labor market projections and in the numerous student needs surveys that have been conducted. The limited demonstrations of career education conducted during the 1974-1978 period produced generally favorable results. As noted earlier, the interest and involvement of several—but not nearly all—leading professional associations operating at the postsecondary education level has been strong and consistent during the decade of the 1970s. All such factors lead toward the reasonableness of an assumption that the career education effort in postsecondary education will probably continue to increase during the decade of the 1980s.

Several factors, however, are currently operating which, in combination, could lead to an opposite prediction. First, if no funds continue to be available under Section 11, P.L. 95-207 for use in demonstrating the best methods and procedures for use in postsecondary career education efforts, it is unlikely that we will ever learn what those "best" methods and procedures are. That is, in these times of financial crisis for postsecondary educational institutions, it seems highly unlikely that we will see an independent effort mounted, in a systematic fashion, that will provide the answers that are so obviously needed here.

Second, to the extent that Federal career education funds continue to be made available in support of K-12 career education efforts—and remain unavailable for use at the postsecondary level—it is inevitable that "career education" will increasingly be viewed as a K-12 effort. This is almost sure to be true in spite of our best efforts to avoid such an unfortunate occurrence. If the term "career education" is perceived by decisionmakers in postsecondary education as one that "belongs" to the K-12 level of Education, it seems highly unlikely that the term will gain much acceptance or use at the postsecondary levels. The *effort* may be seen in postsecondary education, but it will almost surely have some name other than "career education." Ample historical precedent exists to support this prediction. For example, when the term "guidance" was perceived as one applicable at the K-12 level, the term "student personnel services" came into common usage at the postsecondary level for the same generic kind of activity. Similarly, when the term "work-study" became perceived as one used at the secondary school level, institutions of higher education increasingly called that kind of activity "cooperative education." The same thing seems likely to happen in the case of "career education" in the absence of Federal funding carrying the name.

Third, because implementation of the career education concept requires clear involvement and participation on the part of the teaching faculty, it is almost sure to experience difficulty in being implemented at the postsecondary education levels. This is true, not only because of the traditional "academic freedom" barriers to change in common use among teaching faculty members in higher education, but also because, at the postsecondary level, many kinds of programmatic efforts—including such things as cooperative education, internships, and career counseling—which have obvious relationships to career education exist almost completely independent of the teaching faculty.

There is no doubt but that postsecondary education saw the need for and expressed keen interest in career education during the decade of the 1970s. There is considerable doubt regarding what will happen to this part of the total career education effort during the decade of the 1980s.

Changes In Assessing The Effectiveness of Career Education

The formal career education movement, beginning as it did in 1971 as *the* top priority of the United States Office of Education, required no hard

evidence of success in order to be launched. Instead, it was widely proclaimed as "a good thing" that was very badly needed. No movement, begun as the top priority of a given U.S. Commissioner of Education, can expect to continue very long after the tenure of that Commissioner in the absence of either: (a) large congressional appropriations; or (b) some evidence attesting to its effectiveness. Career education has never been "blessed" with large congressional appropriations. Thus, it has had to rely more than many other educational efforts on demonstrating its effectiveness through the production of various kinds of evaluating data. This has been recognized from the start of the career education movement.

Evaluation of career education demonstration projects was a required part of all career education demonstration projects beginning with those funded under Parts C and D of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 and continuing through the 424 career education demonstration projects funded under provisions of Section 406 of P.L. 93-380. Thus, during the 1969-1978 period, a fairly large collection of studies related to evaluation of career education's effectiveness were completed under Federal demonstration efforts. These were supplemented, during that period, by a number of other attempts to evaluate career education—including several doctoral dissertations. The resulting literature has, to a large degree, been summarized and described in several Government publications including:

1. Tuckman, B. W. & J. A. Carducci. *Evaluating Career Education: A Review And A Model.* Report No. 36. National Institute of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.
2. Development Associates, Inc. *Evaluation of Vocational Exemplary Projects: Part D, Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.* Report prepared for the Division of Vocational and Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education, 1975.
3. Enderlein, Thomas. *A Review of Career Education Evaluation Studies.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.
4. Bhaerman, Robert D. *Career Education and Basic Academic Achievement: A Descriptive Analysis of the Research.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.
5. Datta, Lois-ellin et al. *Career Education: What Proof Do We Have That It Works?* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.
6. Bonnett, Deborah G. *A Synthesis of Results and Programmatic Recommendations Emerging From Career Education Evaluations In 1975-76.* Report prepared under Grant Number G007604329. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.
7. *Career Education Programs That Work.* A report prepared for USOE's Office of Career Education by American Institutes For Research. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.
8. Hoyt, K. B. *Evaluation of K-12 Career Education: A Status Report.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

Those studying the publications cited above will find that, while mixed results are present, the general pattern of findings is much more positive than negative. Most of the time, the evaluative studies included in these documents produced evidence that the career education "treatment"—however it was defined—tended to produce positive results. Considering the embryonic stage of development in which career education found itself in those early years, these results are most encouraging indeed.

Further encouragement can be found in the fact that, during the decade of the 1970s, a total of 14 career education demonstration projects produced sufficiently clear evidence of effectiveness that they successfully passed through the U.S. Department of Education's Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP). To pass JDRP, a program must submit, to the JDRP Review Panel, its claims for effectiveness along with hard statistical evidence that those claims are justified by evaluation results. Because of the rigorous nature of the JDRP review process, only a small portion of the many thousands of demonstration programs receiving Federal education funds ever apply for JDRP approval and, of those that apply, only about half are successful in their attempts to gain such approval. The significance of having 14 career education demonstration projects now having successfully obtained JDRP approval can, perhaps, be better understood if one recognizes that, in the many years in which JDRP has operated, a total of only 238 demonstration programs—from all kinds of Federal education demonstration efforts—have successfully passed and gained JDRP approval. These programs, as of November 1980, were in the following categories:

Content Area of JDRP-Approved Programs

	Percentage	No. of Programs
Basic Skills	31	74
Early Childhood/Parent Readiness	18	43
Special Education	11	27
Career/Vocational Education	8	19
Gifted and Talented, Health, Human Behavior, Physical Education	6	14
Alternative Schools/Programs	5	11
Environmental Education/Science	5	12
Preservice/Inservice	5	13
Bilingual/Migrant	4	10
Organization/Administration	4	9
Adult Education	2	4
Arts, Communication, Technology	1	2

SOURCE: "NDN Reporter" No. 10, November 1980. ED Materials/Support Center, Far West Laboratory, San Francisco, California

Of the 19 programs that the Far West Laboratory placed in the category they called "career/vocational education," 13—or 6% of the 238 JDRP approved programs—were in "career education." One way to appreciate the significance of this accomplishment is to note that, while career education

receives less than one-half of one percent of Federal education funds each year, it has 6% of the total number of programs in JDRP! No matter how one chooses to compare data, this must surely be considered to be a significant accomplishment for this, the first decade of existence of career education.

During the decade of the 1970s, USOE's Office of Career Education has encouraged publication of several documents aimed at helping persons interested in evaluating career education become more proficient. These include:

Young, Malcolm B. & R. G. Schuh. *Evaluation and Educational Decision-making: A Functional Guide To Evaluating Career Education*. Washington, D.C.: Development Associates, Inc., 1975.

Hoyt, K. B. *Perspectives On The Problem of Evaluation In Career Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Mitchell, Anita M. *Ways To Evaluate Different Types Of Career Education Activities*. Palo Alto, California: American Institutes For Research, 1978.

Bonnett, Deborah G. *Evaluation Design and Reporting In Career Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Documents such as these are currently being used by many persons as they pursue their current efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of career education.

Further perspective on the difficulties that exist—and the progress that has been made—in evaluating the effectiveness of career education during the decade of the 1970s can be seen by recognizing that it was not until 1977—when the USOE document *A Primer For Career Education* was published—that an official USOE definition of what constitutes the "career education treatment" was published. Many of the earlier evaluation efforts—in spite of their generally positive findings—had used only a portion of what this USOE document defined as the "career education treatment." In December 1980, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Contracts and Grants awarded contracts to three organizations, each of which is to engage in a 2-year effort to establish the fact that the career education "treatment"—as defined in *A Primer For Career Education*—is in place and to evaluate its effectiveness when contrasted with some kind of carefully defined "control" group. When the results of these three evaluation efforts become available, we will have a much better set of data for use in judging the effectiveness of K-12 career education efforts.

Finally, it should be noted that Section 14, P.L. 95-207 requires that a national study of the effectiveness of career education be completed and the results reported to the Congress by September 30, 1982—the year prior to the time P.L. 95-207 is due to expire. Preliminary work, concentrating on the necessary first question; namely, the *evaluability* of career education, was begun in 1979 under a contract awarded to the American Institutes For Research. This project seeks to determine the evaluability of career education both in terms of its *cognitive* goal of equipping persons with the 10 "career

education skills" mentioned earlier and in terms of career education's two *process* goals of (a) gaining increased community linkages with the Education system; and (b) changing the Education system itself. This total effort, when completed in 1982, will also shed further valuable light on the question of career education's effectiveness.

In summary, it seems safe to say that the decade of the 1970s saw the career education movement devoting serious and continuous attention to the task of evaluating the effectiveness of career education. Results obtained during this—career education's first decade of existence—were generally much more positive than negative. However, due in large part to the fact that the "career education treatment" was not well-defined until late in the decade, it will be sometime in the early 1980s before the kinds of hard evidence necessary to answer questions raised by career education's critics will become fully available. So far, the record looks good.

The Decade of the 1980s: The Probable Future of Career Education

The career education movement has survived its first decade of existence—the decade of the 1970s. Considering the fact that the average life of an educational reform movement in the United States is less than three years, the very fact that the career education movement has survived for ten years must, by itself, be considered a significant accomplishment. The preceding discussion makes it clear that, during the decade of the 1970s, the long run goals of career education have become much more modest in scope. In that sense, one could say the movement is weaker in 1980 than it was in 1970. On the other hand, significant progress has been made toward (a) refining and clarifying the meaning of career education; (b) developing methods and strategies for implementing career education; and (c) demonstrating the worth of career education. In all three of these ways, the career education movement is stronger in 1980 than it was in 1970.

There is no doubt but that the decade of the 1980s will be a crucial one for the career education movement. If career education can survive the decade of the 1980s as well as it survived the decade of the 1970s, it seems likely that it will have a continuing influence on the nature and operations of American Education. My purpose here is to identify and discuss what, in my opinion, represents the major variables that will determine the probable fate of career education during the decade of the 1980s. In doing so, readers will hopefully recognize that I do so from the perspective of only one among several persons who purport to determine and influence the meaning of the term "career education." That is, the basic question to be discussed here is the extent to which career education—as I have defined it—will survive the decade of the 1980s. Those with different views with respect to the meaning and goals of career education can be expected to make their own predictions.

In my opinion, career education survivied—and grew—during the decade of the 1970s for two basic reasons; namely (a) the skills it purported to deliver were ones considered as needed but currently missing in American Education; and (2) the career education movement was considered to be a useful vehicle for improving the total effectiveness of the American system of formal Education. If it survives the decade of the 1980s, it will be because of these same two basic reasons. I would want it to survive for no other reason. That is, I consider myself an "educator" first and a "career educator" second. My basic reason for engaging in career education is that I consider it an effort that will (1) help better meet some important education/work relationship needs of persons served by American Education; and (2) help improve the quality and effectiveness of the total *system* of American Education. My concern is equally great in both of these two basic areas. Readers will see both of these concerns reflected in the set of issues to be addressed here as key determiners of the probable future of career education during the decade of the 1980s.

Each of the major issues raised here is discussed in terms of a number of important sub-issues. It is the ways in which each of the sub-issues is resolved that, in combination, will determine how each of the major issues is resolved.

Major Issue #1: To What Extent Will National Priorities Be Devoted To The "Supply," As Opposed To The "Demand" Side, Of The "Supply/Demand Equation?"

There appears to be no doubt but that employment/unemployment problems will be a necessary priority for America during the decade of the 1980s—just as it has in each of the two preceding decades. The changing nature of the occupational society, brought about by a broad combination of factors including energy, transportation, health, science, technology, and international conditions, makes it certain that this will be so. Obviously, two conditions must be present if the magnitude of the problem is to be reduced; namely, (1) jobs must exist to be filled; and (2) persons must be prepared to successfully perform the jobs that exist. Neither side of this basic equation can be ignored. The question is one of determining where the relative emphasis should be placed. During the decade of the 1970s, America appeared to place its major emphasis on *employment* with the bottom line word being the four letter word "jobs." It is possible that the decade of the 1980s may see a major emphasis being placed on *employability* with the bottom line word being the four letter word "work." If even a slight shift is made toward placing a greater National priority on "employability" and a relatively lower National priority on "employment," the American system of formal Education, as part of the total society, will obviously be asked to play a greater role in balancing the "supply/demand equation" during the decade of the 1980s than it was asked to play during the decade of the 1970s. To the extent this actually comes to pass, it would appear on the surface that the career education movement stands a good chance of flourishing during the decade of the 1980s. Whether or not this is true depends on how each of the following sub-issues is resolved.

First, there is a question of convincing both educators and the general public of the vital necessity for providing persons with the 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education. This argument must be made, in part, based on the obvious certainty of uncertainty brought about by the continuing increase in the rate of occupational change thus forcing the typical person to change occupational choices more than once during his/her lifetime. In part, this argument must be made based on the absolute necessity, in a democratic society such as ours, of protecting, to the greatest possible chance, the freedom of the individual to choose his/her own career path. It is a combination of these two factors that makes provision of *all 10* of career education's general employability/adaptability/promotability skills essential. Unless *both* arguments are made, there is danger that some of these skills will be emphasized and others ignored. If this happens, the concept of career education will have lost an essential part of its basic meaning.

Second, there is a question of recognizing – and acting upon – the fact that most of today's youth are not far enough long in their individual career development so as to be in a position to make firm career decisions. Their occupational choice is given as "undecided." Even those who have made initial career choices – and so are ready for specific skill training required to implement such choices – are very likely to be faced with the necessity of changing such choices later in their adult lives. This sub-issue can be satisfactorily resolved only if the goal of "education as preparation for work" is seen as including both the general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education for *all* youth while simultaneously continuing to provide specific entry level vocational skills for those youth who have made initial career decisions. If, during the decade of the 1980s, a confrontation develops around the issue of whether "career education" or "vocational education" is more important, "career education" is almost sure to lose. This is simply because, in a confrontational atmosphere, the short term solution typically wins over the long term solution. Career education will survive in the decade of the 1980s only if it continues to support the goals of vocational education as well as the goals of career education. The relative importance of one versus the other cannot become the issue.

Third, there is a crucial sub-issue here concerning the most viable and effective means of delivering the 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education. The career education movement made great progress during the decade of the 1970s in raising, among many decisionmakers, the basic importance of general employability skills. Some definitive progress was also made toward demonstrating career education's ability to equip youth with such skills. At the present rate of accomplishment, career education should, by the end of 1983, have clear and definite evidence that the 10 career education skills can, given the full career education treatment, be effectively delivered to youth. That is only part of the sub-issue to be faced here.

Two other problems must be faced. One concerns the almost inevitable fact that, during the decade of the 1980s, a number of "short cut" devices will be generated, each claiming itself to be effective in delivering these general employability skills to youth. Such devices will depend on some kind of "add on" approach – as opposed to the "infusion" approach of career education – as their basic methodology. They are almost sure to demonstrate that, for particular segments of the population – and using the kinds of short term immediate criteria of success currently available – that they will be able to deliver employability skills in a matter of weeks or months, as opposed to the several years required in a comprehensive career education effort. The second problem, closely related to the first, is that the longitudinal, developmental "infusion" approach of career education, while *logically* preferable in terms of anticipated long term benefits, cannot, at this point in the short history of the career education movement, be demonstrated. That is, the career education movement has not yet been in existence long enough to demonstrate its

long term effects on, say, 35-year-old persons who, during their K-12 school years, received the "career education treatment." If, because of the use of immediate, short term criteria of success, such new "short cut" methods are chosen over the longitudinal, developmental approach of career education, much of the potential of career education for effecting basic educational change—and so a large part of the rationale for the career education movement itself—will have been lost. We can only hope that educational decision-makers will possess the kind of longer range perspective required to make the kinds of decisions called for here.

From the standpoint of practical financial realities, it would seem that the K-12 public school system, as a part of the total formal Education system, will not be able to afford the relatively large dollar costs required for an "add-on" approach to delivering general employability/adaptability/promotability skills to youth. Thus, if such "add-on" approaches are used, it seems likely that they will be found relatively more often in some kind of alternative or private school setting. Incomplete as it is, career education, with its longitudinal, developmental "infusion" approach, is the only existing approach for delivering these skills to youth with some hard data attesting to its effectiveness. Since the career education approach requires a complete K-12 school system for its effective delivery, this, perhaps, may prove to be an advantage for public school systems in the "public school/alternative school" controversy that seems almost certain to exist during the decade of the 1980s.

Major Issue #2: To what extent can career education continue to be successfully used as a vehicle for increasing school/community "partnership" efforts?

One of the greatest contributions the career education made to American Education during the decade of the 1970s, in my opinion, was to serve as a vehicle for forming many new and productive linkages between the formal Education system and various parts of the broader community. With official National linkages already formed with 16 National community organizations—and with many more linkages now in place at the State/local levels—this effort was well underway by the end of the decade of the 1970s.

Among the basic concepts career education has advanced as part of this total effort are the following: (1) Education is a term whose meaning is much broader than the term "schooling"—i.e., persons learn in many places other than schools and from many persons other than educators; (2) Society has asked the formal Education system to undertake many tasks—including preparing youth for work—that the Education system cannot possibly hope to fully accomplish using only its own resources; (3) Many community resources exist holding high promise for contributing to attainment of the basic goals of the formal Education system; (4) Community resources are willing to be used to help attain the goals of the formal Education system; and (5) The formal Education system should seek to form coalitions with various community

segments that simultaneously provide maximum benefits to youth without, in any way, eroding or destroying the basic legal responsibilities of Boards of Education for establishing policy and setting direction for the formal Education system. Each of these concepts obviously holds implications for the entire Education system and extend far beyond the relatively narrow boundries of the career education movement itself.

One serious sub-issue here that holds great implications for the probable future of career education during the decade of the 1980s has to do with the willingness of various community organizations to continue their career education efforts on a sustaining basis. It is one thing for the formal Education system to ask the broader community for help in solving a particular problem—the broader community is familiar with this kind of request and has repeatedly demonstrated both its ability and its willingness to respond when such requests are made. It is quite another thing to make requests for community assistance that are couched in terms of *continuing* need for assistance on a sustaining basis. Prior to initiation of the career education movement, that kind of request had not been commonplace.

The basic problem here is that, while various community segments are willing and able to help the Education system solve some of its problems, they are *not* used to pleas for help couched in terms that make the problem one that is a *community* responsibility—not simply a responsibility of the Education system itself. Career education has couched its requests for community participation in terms of the need for community *coalitions* aimed at meeting community problems—not simply problems of the Education system itself. It that concept is to be converted into reality, it will be essential that various community organizations view their commitment as a sustaining one—rather than a temporary offer of assistance to be provided until such time as the formal Education system has things under sufficient control so that community participation is no longer needed. As we move into the decade of the 1980s, various community segments have heard—and responded with concrete positive actions—to this plea made by the career education movement. It is still too early to tell whether or not the need for a *sustaining* effort is well understood by either community organizations or by the formal Education system. The future of career education depends on making such understandings clear—and gaining support for them—early during the decade of the 1980s.

A second sub-problem, closely related to the first, is seen in the absolute necessity for giving community organizations participating in career education clear and deserved credit for the contributions they make. Participation in a career education coalition must bring credit to the community organization—as well as help to youth being served—if it survives on a sustaining, rather than a temporary, basis. The formal Education system cannot expect various community organizations to share the blame for failure of the career education effort unless it is also willing to allow each participating community organization to share credit for whatever successes occur. This is a new and

quite different way of thinking about school system/community "partnerships" than has been typical in the past. Much of the future of career education, during the decade of the 1980s, will be dependent on converting this necessary assumption into an operational reality. While some small initial beginnings were made during the decade of the 1970s, it will be the decade of the 1980s that will determine the long run efficacy of this effort.

A third sub-issue stems from the fact that, almost without exception, interest of community organizations in participating in career education coalition efforts has seen each community organization expressing interests in the formal Education system that extend far beyond the relatively narrow confines of career education itself. Such community organizations are not *just* interested in working with the Education system with respect to the goal of "education as preparation for work." Instead, they seem almost always to express keen interest and concern for other basic goals of Education as well. It is unrealistic to expect the formal Education system to ignore such broader interests being expressed by community organizations participating in a career education coalition. This makes it essential that, prior to entering into a coalition effort with any community organization, the Education system must be aware of the broader goals of the community organization that hold implications for operation of the Education system. If one or more of the community organization's goals are inconsistent with those of the formal Education system, it is probable that the community organization should not be asked to become a "partner" in career education. During the decade of the 1970s, these broader—and very serious—implications have not, by and large, been directly addressed by either the career education movement or by the formal Education system. It is essential that this be done consistently during the decade of the 1980s. The ways in which this is done—and the results of such actions—will have a significant impact on the future of the career education movement.

A fourth sub-issue, almost sure to become obvious during the decade of the 1980s, is the question of providing academic credit to youth for experiences gained through participating in activities in the broader community and/or under the general direction of community members as opposed to certificated educators. If we say—and support—the contention that the term "education" is much broader in meaning than the term "schooling" and that youth can and do learn from persons other than educators in places other than school buildings, then there must be some way of converting such contentions into credit given students for the learning that has occurred. The career education movement, while embracing these assumptions during the decade of the 1970s, did little to convert that assumption into the practical realities of awarding academic credit to students. It seems highly unlikely that community participation, as a sustaining effort, is likely to continue throughout the decade of the 1980s until and unless this problem is faced and addressed by educational decisionmakers. While directly affecting the career education movement, it holds serious implications for operations of the entire formal Education system.

Finally, a fourth sub-issue to be resolved during the decade of the 1980s is the ways in which community "partnerships" with the formal Education system are to be established and put into operation. The career education model, developed during the decade of the 1970s, is one that calls for such "partnerships" to be established through actions of the local Board of Education through creation of a "Community Career Education Action Council" whose members are appointed by and report to the Board of Education. When one considers the broader educational concerns already being expressed by various community organizations already participating in the career education effort, it seems obvious that, if this model is a viable one for use, the name of the Council will probably change from that of "Community Career Education Action Council" to "Comumunity Education Action Council." The career education movement has initiated – and tried out – this concept. The future of career education during the decade of the 1980s will, to a significant degree, be determined by the extent to which this concept is accepted – and broadened – by local Boards of Education. It is yet too early to determine how this sub-issue will be resolved.

Major Issue #3: To what extent will career education succeed in bringing about basic change in the formal Education system?

Obviously, most of the major changes in the formal Education system advocated by career education early in the decade of the 1970s have, to date, failed to take place on a wide scale. Instead, the career education movement, during the decade of the 1970s, has narrowed its sights in this area to a relatively few kinds of basic educational changes. While each of these kinds of changes has been demonstrated to be possible, they, too, are far from being implemented Nationwide. As a matter of fact, several leading career education conceptualizers are currently advocating that the career education movement abandon the goal of educational change as one of the basic reasons for existence of the career education movement itself. Instead, such leaders are urging that we concentrate our full efforts toward only providing youth with the general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education. For my part, I remain completely committed to including the goal of basic educational change as one of the primary reasons for existence of the career education movement. Were that goal to be abandoned, I would lose much of my basic motivation for participating in the career education effort. For those who agree with me, there are several crucial sub-issues to be faced during the decade of the 1980s.

Perhaps the most crucially important sub-issue to be addressed here is that career education is asking for basic educational change to occur because it is *needed* – not because the Federal Government is willing to expend billions of dollars to make it happen. The career education movement attempts to bring about change through making the Education system more cost effective – not through making it cost many more dollars. The relatively few additional

dollars required to implement career education are primarily those required for "people change," not "program add-on" efforts. We seek to change the basic attitudes—and so the actions—of educators, students, parents, and the broader community in ways that lead to action efforts reflecting (a) the importance of expanding the meaning of the goal of "education as preparation for work" so that it reflects the 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education; (b) the importance of meeting that goal through a longitudinal, developmental effort beginning in the early elementary school years and involving *all* educators and *all* students; (c) the importance of forming community "partnerships" with the Education system; and (d) the importance of increasing educational productivity.

The problem we face, as we enter the decade of the 1980s, is the same one that faced career education during the entire decade of the 1970s; namely, while educators are generally supportive of the broad goals of career education, they seem still to be expecting large amounts of Federal dollars for use in their efforts to reach such goals. The facts are: (a) *large* amounts of money aren't required to implement career education; and (b) *large* numbers of Federal dollars are unlikely to become available for use in implementing career education during the decade of the 1980s. Career education calls for new kinds of *efforts*, not new kinds of *programs*. The relatively few dollars required to gain such efforts will come basically from re-allocation of existing State and local educational funds—not from "bribes" from the Federal Government in terms of many new Federal dollars.

Most of today's professional educators have never experienced this kind of call for basic educational change. Instead, most have, during their entire professional careers, seen educational change in their school systems come about primarily only when substantial numbers of new Federal dollars were funneled to them. We simply *must* change this kind of traditional expectation if the career education movement is to flourish during the decade of the 1980s. The goals of career education are so obviously needed and so obviously sensible that, if community leaders can see the Education system adopt these goals without asking for large increases in the Education budget, it seems to me that community support for public education will surely increase. That is basically why I have advocated this approach to educational change. It is so vitally necessary that it cannot be abandoned. It is uncertain to what degree it will be understood and accepted by professional educators during the decade of the 1980s.

A second, and closely related, sub-issue is the extent to which understanding and acceptance of career education's basic efforts to change the Education system in ways that lead to increased educational *productivity* will take place. I don't think many persons have yet fully understood how committed the career education movement is to making productivity a priority for America through increasing educational productivity in the formal Education system. The career education "treatment," in terms of those components dealing with the teaching/learning process, is centered almost entirely

around this goal. We seek to concentrate on making the *work* of the student more interesting, meaningful, and challenging to each student through use of a "careers" emphasis. We seek simultaneously to concentrate on making the *work* of the teacher more interesting, meaningful, and challenging to each teacher through use of the "careers" emphasis of career education. We assume that, if we place a student who really *wants* to learn in a room with a teacher who really *wants* to teach, more learning will occur—and educational productivity will be increased. Career education is a vehicle for *motivating* both students and teachers to *work*. It is relatively unimportant to recognize and acknowledge the fact that career education is only one among several approaches available for use in increasing educational productivity. What *is* important is that the American system of formal Education change in ways that lead to a true commitment towards increasing educational productivity. We need to demonstrate to those who pay for public education that they are, in fact, getting reasonable returns for each dollar they invest in Education. Career education is one very powerful vehicle for use in making this happen. Acceptance of the goal of increasing educational productivity—i.e., of giving taxpayers a "bigger bang for the buck"—is certain to be of crucial importance to American Education during the decade of the 1980s. It remains uncertain the extent to which the career education movement will be recognized and used as one means of meeting that goal. Whether or not career education is chosen as one vehicle for use, if the American system of Education changes in ways that provide a clear emphasis on increasing educational productivity and cost effectiveness, the decade of the 1980s will be a good one for Education.

A third sub-issue is the extent to which the career education movement will be successful in its efforts to change American Education in ways that place a greater emphasis on the importance of the basic *goals*—as opposed to instructional methods, objectives, and strategies—of American Education. Career education's specific mission here is, of course, to change the meaning of the goal of "education as preparation for work" in ways that provide a more proper and appropriate emphasis to the 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education. Those who think that is *all* the career education movement seeks to accomplish are missing the basic point very badly. In reality, career education is an effort to bring to the conscious attention of educators, students, parents, and the broader community the entire set of basic goals of American Education. We seek to contribute toward helping the broader community answer the question "Why do we have public schools and why should we support them?"—to helping parents answer the question "Why should I send my children to school?"—to helping students answer the question "Why am I going to school?"—and to helping teachers answer the question "Why am I an educator?." The task of bringing a more proper and appropriate emphasis to the goal of "education as preparation for work" is an immediate one for career education. The long run task is one of bringing about a more proper and pronounced emphasis on *all* the basic goals

of American Education—i.e., on the basic reasons why our Education system exists. That is the change career education seeks to bring about here.

Operationally, this means that, during the decade of the 1980s, career education must continue its efforts to bring about a *proper* and *appropriate* emphasis on the goal of "education as preparation for work" in ways that neither demean or detract from any of the other basic goals of American Education. The worst thing that could happen would be if, in our zeal to emphasize the goal of "education as preparation for work," one or more of the other basic goals of American Education were to be de-emphasized. A "careers" approach to the teaching/learning process cannot—and will not—work if it is the *only* vehicle used for motivating students to learn and for motivating teachers to teach. We are still a long way from bringing about the kinds of educational change that will bring a proper and appropriate emphasis to the goal of "education as preparation for work." When we reach that point, the term "career education" should disappear and, instead, we should be talking only about "good education." It seems highly unlikely that we will reach that point in time during the decade of the 1980s. Yet, this long run goal must be kept clearly in mind.

I have, in no way, abandoned my earlier personal commitment to using career education, to the greatest possible extent, as a vehicle for encouraging such other basic educational changes as: (a) the open entry/open exit system; (b) the year-round school; (c) performance evaluation; (d) increased emphasis on career counseling and guidance; or (e) implementing the concept of lifelong learning. I continue to believe that these—and other—basic kinds of educational change should come about. I further continue to believe that the career education movement could—and should—serve as a vehicle for encouraging these kinds of basic educational change. As we enter the decade of the 1980s, however, I find myself reconciled to the fact that the career education movement is, at this point in time, still too weak and immature to be considered likely to effect many of these changes during the decade. It is hoped that other more powerful forces for educational change will take the lead here.

For my part, I will be satisfied if, during the decade of the 1980s, the career education movement can continue to make some contributions to: (a) changing the meaning of the goal of "education as preparation for work" so as to include the 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education; (b) changing Education system/community relationships in ways that make for community coalition efforts aimed at meeting educational needs of persons; (c) changing Education's approach to change through inserting an emphasis on "people change" rather than "program change"; (d) changing Education's susceptibility to change in ways that allow change to occur without the influx of large amounts of Federal dollars; (e) changing the Education system in ways that bring about a more pronounced emphasis on increasing both educational productivity and the cost effectiveness of Education; and (f) changing perceptions of American education in ways that result

in a greater emphasis on and understanding of the basic *goals* of Education in America. These kinds of educational changes should, in my opinion, represent career education's top priorities for the decade of the 1980s.

Major Issue #4: To what extent can the major deficiencies of career education during the 1970s be overcome during the decade of the 1980s?

It seems safe to say that the career education movement made good progress, during the decade of the 1970s, in its conceptual refinement, demonstration, and initial implementation efforts. At the same time, a number of glaring deficiencies existed during the decade of the 1970s, each of which must, to the greatest extent possible, be corrected during the 1980s. Each of these will be briefly discussed here as a separate sub-issue.

The first glaring deficiency—and, in my opinion, the single most important one was our failure to adequately follow through in implementing our initial conceptualization of career education that included the home and family structure as one of the three basic focal points for the career education effort. Those reading the 1972 book *Career Education: What It Is And How To Do It* will discover that career education was conceptualized as including three basic elements: (a) the Education system; (b) the broader community; and (c) the home/family structure. The decade of the 1970s saw much greater attention paid to both the Education system and to the broader community than to the home/family structure. This is not to say that the area was completely ignored. For example, in 1975, I wrote a short anonymous piece entitled something like "How Parents Can Help Their Children In Career Decisionmaking" which, since being published by USOE's Office of Public Affairs, has apparently received fairly wide publicity. In 1976, one of USOE's Office of Career Education "miniconferences" was devoted exclusively to parents. In 1977, Olympus Publishing Company published a book entitled *Your Child's Career: A Guide To Home-Based Career Education* and, in 1979, the U.S. Government Printing Office published a monograph I wrote, based on another series of miniconferences, entitled *Parents and Career Education: Descriptions Of Current Practices.* In addition, during the 1974-78 period of USOE demonstration projects in career education, one such project was undertaken by the National Congress of Parents and Teachers and resulted in a set of materials for use in helping parents become more actively involved in career education. Finally, it should be noted that, at the local community level, the category of "parents" is typically included among groups to be represented on "community career education action councils." Thus, it is incorrect to say that this area has been ignored during the decade of the 1970s.

In spite of this, the *major* priority early career education conceptual efforts placed on the role of the home/family structure in career education was not converted into an effective operational reality during the decade of the 1970s. Perhaps this was simply due to the fact that Education systems found them

selves faced with more immediately urgent needs to gain initial acceptance within the Education system and to begin using the resources of the broader community. Whatever the reasons, it is clear to me that the decade of the 1980s must carry a major priority on involving parents more fully and effectively in the total career education effort. Both the rights of parents to become involved—and their great potential for making positive contributions to career education—must receive a priority emphasis in the 1980s in my opinion.

A second important sub-issue concerns itself with the extent to which the 1980s will see a concentrated effort to more fully make career education a reality at the postsecondary and adult education levels. A basic interest in making this a reality is evident, in 1980, among large segments of postsecondary and adult education professionals. The relatively few demonstrations of career education carried out at these levels during the 1974-1978 demonstration period generally produced positive and encouraging results. Provision exists in Section 11 of P.L. 95-207 for intensive demonstrations of the best methods and procedures for use in implementing career education at these levels—in spite of the fact that no congressional appropriations have yet been made for this section of the law. There is no way the career education concept makes sense if, in operation, it is limited to the K-12 level of Education. The certainty of occupational change—and thus the accompanying certainty of need for persons to change the occupations in which they choose to engage—makes it mandatory that career education be viewed as part of the lifelong learning movement. If we do not make this a priority effort during the decade of the 1980s, it is unlikely that we will be able to do so during the decade of the 1990s. Action must come now.

A third sub-issue can be seen in the great need for career education to place an even stronger emphasis on unpaid work—as well as on paid employment—in its implementation efforts. Such a dual emphasis obviously does exist in conceptual efforts of career education that existed during the entire decade of the 1970s. Yet, in practice, a much greater emphasis has been placed on paid employment than on unpaid work—including volunteerism and productive use of leisure time. Our goal of making work possible, meaningful, and satisfying for *all* persons cannot possibly be attained if our concern rests primarily only with the occupational society itself. There are too many jobs in the occupational society where "work"—as that term is defined in career education—simply cannot be found. Instead, some jobs in the occupational society provide primarily only drudgery—and, of course, money—to employees. True, the career education movement has placed *some* emphasis on unpaid work during the decade of the 1970s, but not nearly enough. Current involvement in community coalition efforts on the part of community organizations with a primary commitment to volunteerism—such as, for example, the Association of Junior Leagues—hold high potential for correcting this deficiency during the decade of the 1980s. We must move actively to capitalize on this kind of potential.

Fourth, the decade of the 1970s, in my opinion, was deficient in its relative lack of appropriate emphasis on providing adequate career education to minority persons—and to involvement of community organizations representing minority persons—in the total career education effort. Again, this is an area not completely ignored. Rather, it was an area that failed to receive as much emphasis as it deserves. We did publish one USOE monograph on *Minorities And Career Education* along with a number of special papers on the general topic. A National Conference on "Minorities And Career Education" was held in 1972—but it was never actively followed up with concrete actions. Many career education demonstration efforts have involved minority youth—including 13 special demonstration grants specifically aimed at this special portion of the population and another 11 special demonstration grants specifically aimed at low-income youth, many of whom were minority youth. During 1978, USOE's Office of Career Education undertook a major project aimed at establishing closer links between career education efforts and those funded under the Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP) of the U.S. Department of Labor which resulted in some marked attention to career education needs of economically disadvantaged youth. That effort, too, was, to a considerable extent, an expression of interest in and concern for meeting the career education needs of minority youth. Still, in spite of all such efforts, the decade of the 1970s cannot be said to have resulted in the kinds of clear demonstrations required to mount special career education efforts specifically designed to meet the needs of minority persons for *equity* in the delivery of career education. There is an obvious challenge to do better here in the 1980s.

In limiting discussion here to these four sub-issues, I am in no way trying to contend that these were the *only* glowing deficiencies of the career education effort during the decade of the 1970s. Rather, I am simply trying to identify these four sub-issues as ones which, in my opinion, should become major priority areas of concern for career education during the 1980s.

Major Issue #5: To what extent will sound professional leadership for career education be present during the 1980s at the State and local community levels?

Programmatic—as opposed to conceptual—leadership for most kinds of efforts tends to rest where the money is. During the early part of the 1970s, most of the *obvious* dollars being spent to initiate the career education effort were Federal dollars. It was not surprising, then, to find the Federal Government playing a very active role in encouraging career education efforts to get underway. With passage of P.L. 95-207 in 1978, the situation changed drastically. Under provisions of that Act, 92.5% of congressionally appropriated funds for the K-12 portion of the Act were provided, under a formula grant arrangement, to State Departments of Education. The State Departments of Education, in turn, were obligated, under provisions of this law, to

disburse 85% of the funds they received to local K–12 school districts. As a result, we enter the decade of the 1980s with a situation that sees a much greater professional responsibility for the career education movement resting with career education advocates at the State and local levels—and a much reduced responsibility existing at the Federal level. This condition results in two serious sub-issues that must be addressed during the 1980s.

One such sub-issue has to do with the presence, qualifications, and actions of the "State Coordinators of Career Education" which P.L. 95-207 requires each participating State Department of Education to employ. Section 6 of P.L. 95-207 requires the State Department of Education to provide assurances that the person they employ as State Coordinator of Career Education is "experienced in career education." It does *not* require any other special employment qualifications nor does it require that the person serving as State Coordinator of Career Education devote his/her full time to meeting responsibilities of that office. While the position of "State Career Education Coordinator" existed in most State Departments of Education during most of the decade of the 1970s, it was not until passage of P.L. 95-207—"Career Education Incentive Act"—in 1978 when such a position was required by law in all participating State Departments of Education. During the 1974–1978 period, there was an average turnover in persons named as "State Career Education Coordinators" of about 20 percent per year. Since passage of P.L. 95-207 in September 1978—and extending through September 1980—there has been a 42% turnover in persons named as "State Career Education Coordinators." That is obviously part of the problem.

Under provisions of P.L. 95-207, each participating State Department of Education was required to make up a State Plan for career education, consistent with provisions in the law, that contained both specific objectives and specific criteria for assessing each objective for each year of the 5 year period in which P.L. 95-207 is due to operate; i.e., from 1979 through 1983. Each year, the State Career Education Coordinator is required, by provisions of P.L. 95-207, to submit an annual report to the Department of Education's Office of Career Education which requires, among other things, a report of the extent to which each objective in the State Plan—as measured by the specific criteria used to assess each objective—was met. In addition, that Annual Report must include data both with respect to the extent to which State and local funds are being used to supplement Federal funds received under the Act and a description of the most exemplary—and least exemplary—local career education programs being funded with P.L. 95-207 funds. Considering the fact that 42% of the State Coordinators of Career Education employed in December 1980 were different persons than those who had made these State Plans, it is obvious that some difficulty could be expected in completing the Annual Report.

In addition to completing the required Annual Report, each State Career Education Coordinator is also charged with (a) providing State leadership in career education; and (b) selecting and making payments to local school

districts who are, as the law requires, implementing career education. It is a herculean task indeed. When one recognizes that many current State Career Education Coordinators are faced both with being relatively new to their positions and, in addition, having other duties assigned in addition to their career education responsibilities, the task obviously becomes even more difficult. Yet, the 49 State Career Education Coordinators employed in 1980 (in 47 States plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) *are* the prime determiners of where—and how—funds made available under P.L. 95-207 are spent. These 49 persons are the primary professional leaders in the Nation for the implementation of the K-12 portion of P.L. 95-207.

Considering (a) the relative newness of many State Career Education Coordinators; (b) the tremendous responsibilities placed on each of them; (c) the relatively low status many of them enjoy in the hierarchy of their State Department of Education; and (d) the extremely limited P.L. 95-207 funds which, to date, have been made available to them, it is my considered judgment that—almost without exception—the State Career Education Coordinators of this Nation are doing an outstanding job. Obviously, a great and urgent need exists to provide State Career Education Coordinators with technical assistance and consultative help. In spite of the fact that the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Career Education has—because of limited funds—been unable to supply as much help as is needed, the State Career Education Coordinators are moving rapidly ahead to implement career education in their States. They are, further, moving rapidly to ensure that—as the law requires—State and local funds are made available in ever increasing proportions to supplement the limited Federal funds available under P.L. 95-207.

The fate of K-12 career education efforts during the decade of the 1980s will be largely determined, in terms of State leadership functions, by these 49 State Career Education Coordinators. If they are to do what they themselves know needs to be accomplished, it is obvious that they will need: (a) more technical assistance; (b) greater visibility within the State Department of Education; (c) increased staffing for their offices; (d) concentrated assistance from State level operations of many community organizations; (e) professional assistance and linkages with their colleagues in other parts of the State Department of Education; and (f) more State leadership funds than are currently available under provisions of P.L. 95-207. If they receive these kinds of additional support and assistance, it seems likely that the 1980s will be good years for career education. Obviously, the Chief State School Officers of our Nation will be key determiners of the fate of their State Career Education Coordinators—and so of the K-12 career education efforts in their States.

The second sub-issue here concerns itself with career education coordinators employed at the local community level and charged with professional responsibility for K-12 career education efforts. Several hundreds such persons were employed during the 1970-1978 period of K-12 career education demonstration grants using Federal funds. Under provisions of P.L. 95-207,

such local K-12 "Career Education Coordinators" can be employed at the school district—but not at the school building—level. Many persons now occupying such positions are ones who led earlier career education demonstration efforts during the 1970-1978 period. Many others are new to their positions—and to the career education movement. In spite of whether they are "experienced" or "inexperienced" persons, the local K-12 Career Education Coordinators are responsible for spending, among them, 85% of the total P.L. 95-207 funds that come to their States. Obviously, the future of career education during the 1980s will depend, to a very large degree, on the wisdom and commitment they use in carrying out their functions.

Under provisions of P.L. 95-207, the local K-12 Career Education Coordinators can devise proposals (which they submit for funding to their State Department of Education) calling for expenditure of funds in any or any combination of 13 kinds of career education implementation activities called for in Section 8(a)(3) of the Act. Each not only has to devise her/his plan for spending these funds but, in addition, is responsible for preparing others and enlisting their support and involvement in the implementation of career education. It is vitally important to recognize that career education, unlike many other kinds of educational efforts, is *not* seen as something to be carried out only by a person carrying the title of "Career Education Coordinator." On the contrary, the primary task of the Career Education Coordinator is to make the implementation of career education a total *community* effort. Both professional educators, at the entire K-12 level, and members of the broader community are to become involved in this implementation effort. Like their counterparts at the State Department of Education level, these K-12 Career Education Coordinators are faced with a formidable set of challenges.

As is true for State Career Education Coordinators, Federal funds for use in paying part—or all—of the salaries of local K-12 Career Education Coordinators is due to expire after 1983. When that time comes, both of these kinds of crucial positions will have to be funded with State and local resources—or else these vital positions will almost surely be abolished in many States and local communities.

Over the decade of the 1970s, it was a combination of State and local career education coordinators who served as the primary catalysts for initiating and sustaining career education efforts. There were only 49 State Career Education Coordinators employed at the end of 1980. Each will be a key determiner of the future for K-12 career education efforts. There were probably about 1,000 local community coordinators of career education employed at the K-12 level by the end of 1980 who were *experienced* in career education. This small cadre of local K-12 career education coordinators, during the decade of the 1970s, were the persons who really "invented" career education through the innovative and creative approaches they devised for its implementation. They have, in addition, contributed greatly to refining the career education concept in helpful ways. Whatever it is we can say is known about career education in 1980 represents, to a considerable degree, the combined wisdom

and practical experiences these local K-12 career education coordinators have shared with each other—and with others. If some wonder how the career education movement managed to survive the decade of the 1970s, they can find the basic answer through studying the qualities and actions of these experienced local K-12 career education coordinators. It is *they* who, above all others, created and gave substance to the career education movement. The future of career education, during the decade of the 1980s, will depend more on this small band of experienced local K-12 career education coordinators than on any other single set of "actors" in the entire career education movement. It is vital that they continue to be employed—and listened to.

Concluding Statement

In this monograph, I have tried to provide a picture, based on my own personal perspective, both of what happened to the career education effort during the decade of the 1970s and what seems likely to happen during the decade of the 1980s. My perspective is obviously colored by the position I have occupied since February of 1974 when I became the Director, Office of Career Education, at the Federal level. The picture of career education presented here is as accurate as I know how to make it. That, of course, does not mean it is correct. Persons in other positions are almost sure, because of the perspective they enjoy, to paint a different picture from that presented here.

No matter who reviews what happened to career education during the decade of the 1970s, it seems to me that their conclusions will, like mine, surely be generally positive. There is no doubt but that the career education movement did much more than only "survive" the decade of the 1970s; i.e., it actually grew both in sophistication and in magnitude.

It is very dangerous for anyone to attempt to make predictions for a full decade ahead, as I have tried to do in this monograph, with respect to any field. The predictions—and problems—I have voiced here are presented simply for what they are; namely, my best personal guesses with respect to what is likely to occur. If any copies of this monograph are in existence in 1990, perhaps someone will want to look at these predictions and determine how many are right—and how many are wrong. Those doing so should keep in mind that these predictions were made under an assumption that further refinements in the conceptualization of career education—which obviously will continue to be required—will be built upon the basic conceptual picture presented here. Since the conceptual view presented here has been the result of the collective thinking and advice given me by more than 2,000 participants in the 165 "miniconferences" I have conducted since coming to the Federal level, it seems to me that this is a reasonable assumption. That is, insofar as possible, the views I have expressed here represent a *National*—not a *Federal*—position. In saying this, I am quite willing to admit that this "National" view is obviously tainted with my own personal biases. There is no way to avoid that.

As I look back on the decade of the 1970s, I find myself minimally satisfied but far from content with what, to date, has taken place in the career education movement. We have not advanced as far as I had *hoped* we would, but we have come further than I *expected* we would. Career education has demonstrated both the reasons why it is needed and its ability to deliver on its basic promises. It certainly has demonstrated itself to be considerably more than simply another educational fad. It has some substance and it has produced some results. It is, in my opinion, ready to face the crucial challenges of the 1980s.

Appendix

Government Printing Office Monographs Authored by K. B. Hoyt

An Introduction To Career Education: A Policy Paper Of The U.S. Office of Education. (1974)

Career Education And The Business-Labor-Industry Community. (1976)

The School Counselor And Career Education. (1976)

Community Resources For Career Education. (1976)

Career Education For Special Populations. (1976)

K–12 Classroom Teachers And Career Education: The Beautiful People. (1976)

Relationships Between Career Education And Vocational Education. (1976)

Refining The Career Education Concept. (1976)

Application Of The Concept Of Career Education To Higher Education: An Idealistic Model. (1976)

Perspectives On The Problem Of Evaluation In Career Education. (1976)

A Primer For Career Education. (1977)

Career Education: Implications For Counselors. (1977)

Refining The Career Education Concept: Part II. (1977)

Refining The Career Education Concept: Part III. (1978)

Considerations Of Career Education In Postsecondary Education. (1978)

The Concept of Collaboration In Career Education. (1978)

Refining The Concept Of Collaboration In Career Education. (1978)

Rotary International And Career Education. (1978)

American Legion/American Legion Auxiliary And Career Education. (1978)

Future Farmers Of America And Career Education. (1978)

Women's American ORT And Career Education. (1978)

National Alliance Of Business And Career Education. (1978)

Chambers of Commerce And Career Education. (1978)

The National Federation Of Business And Professional Women's Clubs & Career Education. (1978)

Exploring Division, BSA, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., And Career Education. (1978)

Junior Achievement, Inc. And Career Education. (1978)

4–H And Career Education. (1979)

YEDPA And Career Education. (1979)

Parents And Career Education: Descriptions Of Current Practices. (1979)

Refining The Career Education Concept: Part IV. (1979)

Community Involvement In The Implementation Of Career Education. (1979)

The Community Career Education Coordinator. (1979)

Funding For K–12 Career Education Efforts: Examples and Recommendations. (1979)

Career Education And Organized Labor. (1980)

Evaluation Of K–12 Career Education: A Status Report. (1980)

The Association Of Junior Leagues And Career Education. (1980)

LEA/Prime Sponsor Relationships: Practitioner Suggestions For Successful Solutions. (1980)

Implementation Issues In Career Education. (1980)

Staff Development In K–12 Career Education. (1980)

NRTA/AARP And Career Education. (1980)

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1981 O—337—871